

w in the

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINE OF JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Edited by A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, B.D.,

Vicar of Guilden-Morden ;

Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Durham.

I. THE HOPE OF CATHOLICK JUDAISM.

By J. H. A. HART, M.A.,

Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

THE
Hope of Catholic Judaism:

AN ESSAY TOWARDS ORIENTATION.

BY

J. H. A. HART, M.A.,

Fellow and Lecturer of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Say, I pray, to Hezekiah : Thus says the great King, the
King of Assyria : *What is this confidence wherein thou
confidest ?*

OXFORD : PARKER & CO.,

27 BROAD STREET.

LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & Co.

1910.

TO
HARVEY COACHES

BM615

.H33.

Orient. Inst.

335338

TO MY WIFE.

*He that getteth a wife beginneth to thrive,
a help meet for him and a pillar of rest.*

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE object of these Studies is to discuss Judaism in its history, or its doctrines, from a Christian stand-point, and to bring before both Christian and Jewish readers the relation that Christianity holds to Judaism. For not a few Christians fail to take into account the close connexion that exists between the two religions, and many Jews woefully misinterpret Christianity.

The part of the Editor is to see that each paper carries out the object of the series. With this restriction each writer will be left free, and will alone bear all responsibility.

A. LUKYN WILLIAMS.

GUILDEN-MORDEN,
Sept., 1910.



P R E F A C E.

To the Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge.

DEAR PROFESSOR SWETE,

As this little book is an attempt to put together some things learned in the study of Ecclesiasticus, it seems proper that I should address my personal explanation to you who launched me on that voyage. The debt I have your leave to acknowledge now, goes back to the time when I began to read for the Theological Tripos, and suggested to you that I had the Septuagint of Van Ess, and did I need your Old Testament in Greek also? You spoke of the great manuscripts; and I began to realise that Professor Hort's Introduction applied to books other than the books of the New Testament. The course of reading, which I undertook for the Tripos under your direction, included the History of Israel, the New Testament in Greek and other matters, with the connecting links of some Philo and 2 Maccabees. Then, as I was beginning to see something of the life behind the books, you trusted me with Cod. 248 of Ecclesiasticus, which throws out tentacles in all directions, and encouraged me to read round that. When I got glimmerings of theories to cover the evidence, you sent me to Dr. Schechter, who waved

his hand at the Wilna Talmud and said, It's all in there. So I trespassed on the preserve of the Talmudists with the help of Dr. Taylor's great edition of the Sayings of the Jewish Fathers and the Mishnah of Surenhusius.

It was long before I had anything to shew you, for my theories needed a background. But as I worked here and there, it was borne in upon me that there was one living faith in God—a Catholick Judaism—which St. Paul shared with Philo and, behind all their multifarious differences in non-essentials, with all the Pharisees. The essence of this Catholick Judaism, as I see it, was Hope in God and Hope for God, whenever He hid His face as He hid it even from Moses. And, since no man might see God's face and live, it was Hope for a perfect man who should speak for God to mankind once for all, and confirm the Covenant by which Israel—the Jews and the mixed multitude who were ready to go up from Egypt into the wilderness to find Him—were inseparably bound to the Everlasting Father. There were Christs who were thieves and robbers, but the sheep did not hear them. They served their generation and met immediate needs, whereas Moses, as Josephus says, influenced all posterity. Even the Jews and priests who proclaimed Simon, brother of Judas Maccabæus, as the Seed by which God had saved His people from extermination, to be prince and high-priest for ever, published even in that New Age their craving for a

Faithful Prophet. But who could recognise this Absolute and Final Christ of God until His work was done and His message tested by experience? Many rebelled against Moses in his lifetime, when the verdict of posterity was still to seek. So when in the fulness of time—though Rome still protected the Jews in the full exercise of their religion and the danger was not apparent—this Arch-prophet was actually sent by God to deliver Israel, many of the Pharisees waited to see what the end should be. Many doubted, and not only nominal Christians of whom St. Matthew speaks.

Thou ! if Thou wast He, who at mid-watch came
By the starlight, naming a dubious name !
And if, too heavy with sleep—too rash
With fear—O Thou, if that martyr-gash
Fell on Thee coming to take Thine own,
And we gave the Cross, when we owed the
Throne—

They refused to accept the Gospel and became, many think, no better than dry bones. Nevertheless, as in the vision of Ezekiel, the bones came together, bone to his bone. It was a good Jew or a good Christian who said, *Read not He guided them to the haven of their will, but He guided them with the watchful care of His will*^a.

^a Psalm cvi. (cvii.) 30 : καὶ ὠδήγησεν αὐτοὺς ἐπιμελία (ἐπὶ λιμένα
Sc. a. ART) θελήματος αὐτοῦ (αὐτῶν R.).

But what I have seen I have tried to tell in this essay. I owe you the keys of that ancient world. Your Biblical and patristic learning has pointed me to the road. Your permission given to make this acknowledgment of my debt only increases it, and so I would say after you this also :

Domine Deus, quaecunque dixi in hoc libro
de tuo, agnoscant et tui ; si quae de me et tu
ignosce et tui.

J. H. A. HART.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITOR'S PREFACE - - - - -	vii
AUTHOR'S LETTER TO PROFESSOR SWETE -	ix—xii
CHAPTER I. Introductory—The Jewish Conception of Hope—Philo's Conception of Hope—The Content of the Jewish Hope - - -	1—42
CHAPTER II. The Title Messiah or Christ—The Rabbinic doctrine of the Messiah—Messiahs in the Old Testament—The Messiah as Prophet— The Messiah as the future Emissary of God— The Messiah in the New Testament—The Messiah in Josephus - - -	43—75
CHAPTER III. The Modern View of the Jewish Hope—The Modern View of the Son of David— The Son of David the Hope of the Zealots—The meaning of the title Son of David—The Anti- Christian Conception in Celsus—The Jewish Messiah in Justin Martyr—The Suffering Messiah—The Son of David at full length	76—105
CHAPTER IV. The Modern view of the Son of Man—Apocalyptic—The circumstances of Apo- calyptic—One like a Son of Man—The Son of Man - - -	106—139

CHAPTER V. The Messianic Idea in History—The Great Apostasy of the Jews—The Maccabean Martyrs—The turning of many to righteousness —The failings of God's Champions—The New Age—The period of Expectation—John Baptist —Jesus Christ	- - - - -	140—162
---	-----------	---------

THE HOPE OF CATHOLICK JUDAISM.

THE HOPE OF CATHOLICK JUDAISM.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

HOPE—according to Locke the philosopher—is that pleasure in the mind which everyone finds in himself, upon the thought of a profitable future enjoyment of a thing which is apt to delight him. And, although we speak of *good hope*, the English word does not seem to be naturally capable of a bad sense. Cowley speaks of

Hope, whose weak being ruin'd is,
Alike if it succeed, or if it miss ;

but, even here, Hope is hope of some good and the opposite of despair ; and, to get even a neutral word, the English language must borrow *expectation* from the Latin. Christianity certainly confirmed and fixed this conception of Hope ; but its limitation may possibly be the expression of a native instinct, which led even pagan Anglo-Saxons to hope for the best from the unknown future. Native or Christian, the content of the word is determined. In his *Answer*^a

^a See Poems by Richard Crashaw, Cambridge, 1904, pp. 295—298.

Crashaw quotes the Christian definition of *Faith*^b against Cowley's un-English and un-Christian attack upon Hope :

Dear hope ! earth's dowry, and heaven's debt !
 The entity of those that are not yet
 Subtlest but surest being ! Thou by whom
 Our nothing has a definition !

Substantial shade . . .

Faith and Hope are for him, as for most of us, inseparably linked together :

Rich hope ! love's legacy, under lock
 Of faith . . .

Though temporary disappointments intervene, the Christian Hope remains to banish fear and to set fortune at defiance :

Fortune ? alas above the world's low wars
 Hope walks ; and kicks the curled heads of conspiring stars.

Her keel cuts not the waves where These winds stir,

Fortune's whole lottery is one blank to her.

Sweet hope ! *kind* cheat ! *fair* fallacy by thee
 We are not WHERE nor WHAT we be,
 But WHAT and WHERE we would be. Thus art thou

Our absent PRESENCE, and our future NOW.

Faith's sister . . .

^b Hebrews xi. 1 : ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων.

But, at the end of Crashaw's poem, there is an implied distinction which may serve as a stepping-stone from Christian England to pagan Greece :

True hope's a glorious hunter and her chase
The God of nature in the fields of grace.

If there is a *true* hope, there must be a *false* hope also ; and, since ancient Greece was pagan, it becomes easier for us to understand why Hope was once denounced as the curse of mankind.

Moreover the *Greek* word, *Elpis*, has in itself the dangerous ambiguity of *expectation* ; and, as men were inclined or driven to pessimism, *Elpis* was likely to come nearer to the sense of Fear. Take, for example, Clytemnestra's defiance of the condemnation passed upon her by the liegemen of her murdered husband :

Now, by this Justice taken for my child,
By Dooms and Furies who claim death for death—
My Hope remains without the house of Fear,
Long as Aegisthus makes his home with me,
My friend, as heretofore . . .

The audience, who first heard the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus^c, knew as well as he did, what response the future held in store for her ; and the word *Elpis* expresses in itself the tragic irony of the scene. The murderess could not read the future, and, therefore, she made oath that her Hope had no fear in it.

^c Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 1432—1436.

Knowledge of that future turns the boast into a warning against Hope.

This ambiguity is stated explicitly by Plato in the *Laws*^d:

Each one of us has within himself two counsellors: both of them are irrational and foolish, and, at the same time, they are mutual enemies: we call them Pleasure and Pain. Beside these we have opinions about the future, to which we give the general name of "Hope" (*Elpis*) or Expectation, and these fall into two classes. The "Hope" which precedes and anticipates Pain is called Fear; and the "Hope" which precedes or anticipates Pleasure is called Confidence^e—Hope, that is, in the proper sense of the English word.

Apart from the ambiguity of *Elpis* (considered in reference to its object) which arose from the proverbial uncertainty of the future, and apart from its tendency to assume the aspect of fear in consequence of what emancipated thinkers regarded as vulgar superstitions, the thing itself, the very state of expectancy, was regarded by some of the Greeks as an evil, on the ground of sufficient experience. After the defeat of the Invincible Persian Armada, the Athenians—Athens always was Greece, the essence of Hellenism, for enquiring barbarians—were filled with confidence, and looked forward to

^d i. p. 644.

^e θάππος.

the future with a Hope that would not cross the threshold of Fear. They had beaten back the vast armies of the Persian Empire and the fleets of its vassals—the Persians, whom no Greeks had dared to face before. It was natural enough for them to feel that they had proved the Greek race to be supreme in the world and themselves to be superior to all other Greeks. The King of Persia was known to every Greek as KING, without even the distinction of a definite article. There was no need to say *The King* when you spoke of him. And the Athenians, construing his discomfiture as utter disaster, concluded that, as his conquerors, they had inherited his rights in all the world, and they dreamed of taking possession. They were filled with Hope and would not listen for the Voice of the gods, that *daughter of golden Hope*, but for whom Hope herself brought and could bring nothing but disaster. They dethroned their Virgin-goddess, Athena, and set up “Hope” in her room with such whole-hearted devotion that Artemidorus, the interpreter of dreams, must say long after: “If you see a maiden (*Parthenos*) it is either Elpis or Artemis or Athena: if she is smiling it is Elpis, and if she looks grave it is Artemis.” With Pericles dead, with Cleon and the like of him at the head of the state, the Athenians abandoned themselves to Hope, and saw smiles on the face of the *Parthenos* which Pheidias had made for the Parthenon.

It was not for want of warning that they fluttered

on the tip-toe of excitement, like so many *Birds* to the eyes of Aristophanes. Even Sophocles—good easy man[†]!—the popular tragic-dramatist of the Periclean Age, had something to say about this pestilential Hope which obsessed them when the Plague had spent its force.

In the *Antigone* the chorus of Theban elders have this to sing, when Creon has decided upon the death of Antigone :

'Tis now as it hath ever been,
 And still in years to come
 The old order will not change :
 Never from human life departs
 The universal scourge of man,
 His own presumptuous pride.
 Hope wings her daring flight,
 By strong winds borne afar—
 And some are blessed ; and some
 Are cheated of their vain desires,
 That learn their folly all too late,
 When in the fire they tread with scorched feet §.

His Ajax, again, after the passing of his madness, in which he slew cattle thinking them to be his enemies, decides that suicide becomes a man better than a life of empty hopefulness :

Base is the craving for the longer life,
 When life is misery, and unrelieved.

[†] Aristophanes, *Frogs* 82.

[§] Sophocles, *Antigone* 611—620 (R. Whitelaw's translation).

What joy has day that alternates with day,
And this brings nigh and that draws off from—
death?

Too dear I count him at the cheapest rate
Who warms his heart with visionary hopes.
Nobly to live or nobly die, there is
No choice for brave men else. My say is said^h.

Then at the very beginning of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*
another chorus of Theban elders rings the knell
of inevitable damnation :

Low at thy feet I am laid, with my heart in
a flutter of fear,
Delian, Healer Apollo !
Filled full of wonder and dread,
What stern requirement thou wilt enact for us,
What word of doom, or new or old,
Come with revolving seasons back—
O tell us, daughter of golden Hope,
Immortal Voiceⁱ !

But Athens was deaf to any Voice from heaven ;
she was determined to live on and redeem her
disasters ; and she was unmoved by the unwritten
law of mercy which sent Antigone to her martyrdom.
She had but scotched the snake of tyranny and she
was fain to wield the sceptre, at which the Persian
had vainly grasped, and held it herself, lest the snake
should die. Her demagogues—Cleon and the rest

^h Sophocles, *Ajax* 473—480 (R. Whitelaw's translation).

ⁱ Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 153—158.

of them—fooled her to the top of her bent, and fed the free democracy on—Hope, and hopes for hopes in a would-be interminable succession.

Pericles himself—or the Pericles of Thucydides—had warned the Athenians of their danger. Hope, for him, was nothing more than the comfort of the desperate. What they needed was not the courage of despair but cool calculation and provision against calculable requirements^k. Pericles was dismissed from office and fined for the speech in which this warning was given. Later on in his History Thucydides credits the Athenian speaker in the Melian Dialogue with a similar idea :

Hope is a consolation in time of peril. If a man with a superfluity of resources indulges in it, it may hurt him, but it cannot ruin him. But if men stake their entire resources on one cast of the dice and lose, they are proved guilty of Hope in the last degree ; and, if a man try to keep this precious treasure, after it has been found out and proved to be futile, he's got nothing left, not even Hope^l.

It is characteristic of most men that, when

^k Thucydides ii. 62 : καὶ τὴν τόλμαν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμολας τύχης ἢ ξύνεσις ἐκ τοῦ ὑπέρφρονος ἐχυρωτέραν παρέχεται, ἐλπίδι τε ἥσσον πιστεύει, ἥς ἐν τῷ ἀπὸρῳ ἢ ἰσχύς, γνώμη δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, ἥς βεβαιότερα ἢ πρόνοια.

^l Thucydides v. 103 : ἐλπίς δὲ κινδύνῳ παραμύθιον οὔσα τοὺς μὲν ἀπὸ περιουσίας χρωμένους αὐτῇ, καὶ βλάβῃ, οὐ καθεῖλε· τοῖς δ' ἐς ἅπαν τὸ ὑπαρχον ἀναρρίπτουσι (δάπανος γὰρ φύσει) ἅμα τε γιγνώσκεται σφαλέντων, καὶ ἐν ὅτῳ ἔτι φυλάσσεται τις αὐτὴν γνωρισθεῖσαν, οὐκ ἐλλείπει.

their visible hopes are put to flight by disappointments—though they might still save themselves by human means—, they betake themselves to the invisible and intangible hopes, to divination and oracles and anything else of the kind that tempts men to hope on until they are ruined ^m.

Hope to the mind of Thucydides, who had seen the power of Athens shattered by the Sicilian Expedition, was a prodigal and improvident spendthrift. And he condemned the natural tendency of beaten men to take refuge in the vague and impalpable hopes inspired by the popular religion, as even more disastrous than the hopes they placed in an exaggerated notion of their own resources.

Cowley concurs :

Hope fortune's cheating lottery

Where for one prize, an hundred blanks there
be . . .

Thin empty cloud which the eye deceives

With shapes that our own fancy gives,

A cloud which gilt and painted now appears

But must drop presently in tears

When thy false beams o'er reason's light
prevail,

By IGNES FATUI for north stars we sail.

^m τοῖς πολλοῖς, οἷς παρὸν ἀνθρωπείως ἔτι σώζεσθαι, ἐπειδὴν πιεζομένους αὐτοὺς ἐπιλίπωσιν αἱ φανεραὶ ἐλπίδες, ἐπὶ τὰς ἀφανεῖς καθίστανται, μαντικὴν τε καὶ χρησμοὺς καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα μετ' ἐλπίδων λυμάνεται. It seems quite obvious that in Ἑλλείπει and ἐπιλίπωσιν Thucydides is echoing the sound, or if not building on the popular etymology of ἐλπίς, which is (as Philo says) ἐλλιπής.

Brother of fear more gaily clad.
 The merrier fool o' the two, yet quite as mad.
 Sire of repentance, child of fond desire
 That blowest the chymick and the lover's fire.
 Still leading them insensibly on
 With the strong witchcraft of Anon.

That is the Greek conception of Hope, and, verified as it was by the experience of Athens, it had also, what was for the Greeks, the *Scriptural* authority of Hesiod :

But yesterday men lived upon the earth
 Free from all evil, free from grievous toil,
 From grievous ailments fraught with death and
 doom :

And then the Woman took the fateful Box
 (Wherein Prometheus for his love of men
 Had stored whate'er could mar their happiness,
 And straitly charged her that she should not
 touch it),

Removed its cover, and discharged abroad
 All the dire evils that afflict us now
 Save only Hope, who lingered at the brim
 Fluttering, but prisoned by the lid replacedⁿ . . .

It is abundantly clear from this passage (which is quoted by Plutarch as Hesiod's in a *Consolation*^o

ⁿ Hesiod, *Works and Days* 90—98. Flack pronounces against the authenticity of the piece ("Unhesiodisches Fragment über Entstehung der Leiden") on internal evidence. I have added the three lines enclosed in round brackets to explain the situation.

^o *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 7.

addressed to a bereaved friend) that Hope was one of the evils, like death and disease and hard labour, from which men were free in the Age of Innocence. It was reserved for commentators to reflect that if not through the agency of the Woman Pandora then at some later time Hope had escaped from custody to plague mankind; and Aristarchus reconciled the facts of experience with the authority of Hesiod by pointing out—like any Patristic commentary on the Bible—that there are two kinds of Hope. Oddly enough he says that the Hope of evil remained in the Box, while the Hope of good came out, “wherefore we use the word improperly when we speak of *hoping for evil* things^p.” The reconciliation makes utter nonsense of the myth; but such commentators are content to take one difficulty at a time without regard to the general sense of their exegesis or much respect for the plain sense of their authors. It is their business to apply the text to the needs of their own age and to expound it rather than interpret it.

But the pious opinion of Aristarchus—it was an act of piety to maintain a statement of Hesiod—has nothing in common with the solemn verdict of *Guilty* which Thucydides, in accordance with the overwhelming weight of the evidence, passed upon

^p Quoted from Proclus in Goettling's note: πῶς φησὶν, ἔμεινεν ἐν τῷ· πίθῳ ἡ Ἑλπίς· ἔστι γὰρ τοῦτο ἐν ἀνθρώποις . . . φησὶν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχος ὅτι ἡ μὲν τῶν κακῶν ἔμεινεν ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐξῆλθεν, ὅθεν ἀκυρολογούμεν λέγοντες ἐλπίζειν κακά· ἡ γὰρ ἐλπίς κακῶν οὐ θην (“Hope is certainly not hope for evils”: the printed text has κακῶν, οὐ θεῶν). ὁ δὲ Ἡσίοδος ἀκέρως ἐπὶ κακῶν εἶπεν.

Hope as the chief mover in the suicide of the Athenian democracy. The Hope of the Greeks, in the familiar Talmudic phrase, flew about in the air and had nothing on which to rest. They disregarded the Voice of Heaven which they might have heard in the sterner tones of the Delphic oracle—*Know thyself*, thy limitations, thy nothingness^q; and *Nothing in excess*. The warnings of Sophocles and Hesiod fell upon deaf ears, as it is written :

The hope of the ungodly shall perish^r.

The Jewish Conception of Hope.

The Seventy men (more or less) who rendered the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek were on the whole agreed that, in spite of its old associations with democracy and disaster, the word *Elpis* could safely be used in the far different sense of *Hope in God, good-hope, or confidence*.

The Pentateuch, the book of the Law, by which the Jews were bound—according to their several stations—to order their lives, called for translation as soon as there were Jews or proselytes in the Dispersion who had no Hebrew and no scribe to interpret for them, as Ezra did for the Jews of Palestine. In Deuteronomy^s it is written :

^q Philo and Plutarch are agreed in this interpretation of the maxim.

^r Proverbs xi. 23 (Septuagint). C. H. Toy prefers to render :

The desire of the righteous issues only in good,

The expectation of the wicked in wrath.

^s xxiv. 14, 15.

Thou shalt not oppress a poor man, whether he be Jew or proselyte, or withhold his wages at the end of his day's work, because he is poor and *sets his hope upon it*, and he shall cry against thee unto the LORD.

The Hebrew is literally *lifteth up his soul to it*, but the translator gives the proper force of this idiom, using *Elpis* for a legitimate hope of earned reward, the claim to which will be upheld by Jehovah.

After the Law, since everything goes to shew that the Greek Bible was originally connected with the greatest of all the Dispersions at Alexandria, it is natural to suppose that the Psalms were translated at once in order that the Jews who met in their Synagogues might have hymns to sing in the language they could understand. Indeed one is almost inclined to wonder if the songs did not precede the Law. For after all much of the Pentateuch has little bearing upon the normal life of the ordinary man, and what did concern him could have been committed to memory, learned by heart from oral instruction, and actually seems to have been so learned by Jewish children in their homes. But hymns must be understood (rightly or wrongly) if they are to be sung with fervour, and in Alexandria hymns were of the first importance. If the Jews of Alexandria resisted the influence of their environment, it was essential that they should satisfy this inborn craving of their

converts; and after all, such relics of the Temple liturgy were able to recall to them and to quicken within them something of the spirit of worship which came upon pilgrims in the Temple itself. The pathetic words, *How shall I sing the Lord's song in a strange land*, are the beginning of a Psalm. But, as for the native inhabitants of Alexandria, their love of songs was notorious, and even the Cynics set to work upon the unphilosophical task of composing them. The Jews had only to translate the Psalms of David.

In the Greek version of the Psalms the word *Elpis* is prominent. One after another takes up the refrain of thanksgiving, *Thou, Lord, art my Hope*, till it seems to permeate the whole collection. The word is consecrated and seems never to be used in any other way.

In Wisdom-literature, which, for all its practical homespun wisdom, has a real relation to Greek thought—if only the relation which issues from antagonism—the translators sometimes admit the word in other connexions. Ben Sira says roundly^t :

Vain and false are the hopes of a fool.

But as the prologue shews—and it is the only first-hand evidence for the motives and the history of the Septuagint—he was concerned to prove that the Jews were superior to the Greeks in their own field of the philosophy of life. In Proverbs the word

^t Ecclesiasticus xxxi. (xxxiv.) 1.

is once used in what may be called the Greek sense of mere hope—hope and nothing more :

Better one that begins to help with all his heart
Than one that promises and brings a man into
a state of hope ^u.

But even these translators of books which came to closer grips with Greek life than the Law with its broad principles and its provisions for other contingencies, or the Prophets—these men, who conceived it their duty to enrich the deposit they had received and to put the whole twenty talents in due form for world-wide circulation, used *Elpis* fearlessly. The word had already been purified when the Seventy “prepared the way for our Saviour among the *Gentiles* by written preaching^x” of the Hope of Israel, when the Jews no longer pined in selfish isolation, brooding over their buried talent and saying *My secret is mine, My secret is mine*, but left their tents to bring good tidings to the world, and gleaned their broken fulfilments of Isaiah’s triumphant vision^y—“O Lord, the God

^u xiii. 12 : κρείσσων ἐναρχόμενος βοηθεῖν καρδίᾳ τοῦ ἐπαγγελλομένου καὶ εἰς ἐλπίδα ἄγοντος. Toy renders the Hebrew text by: *Hope deferred maketh the heart sick* (Aquila ἐλπίς ἐκτεταμένη ἀρρωστία καρδίας), but *desire fulfilled is a tree of life*. The Greek is a thoroughly Greek misrepresentation.

^x The Translators (of 1611) to the Reader (A.V. Variorum Reference Bible xviii, foot of second column).

^y Isaiah xxiv. 16 : Κύριε ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ἀπὸ τῶν πτερύγων τῆς γῆς τέρατα ἡκούσαμεν Ἑλπίς τῷ εὐσεβεῖ. At this point there is a gap in the uncial texts which is filled by a loan from Theodotion: τὸ

of Israel, we have heard wonders from the ends of the earth, voices crying, There is Hope for the Righteous."

Philo's Conception of Hope.

Hope, then, for the Jews who wrote or read the Bible in Greek was Hope in God. They prized it for its present value just as Thucydides condemned it for its present effect. It was both for the Jew and for the Greeks a state of mind, an attitude towards God, as they severally conceived God; and its value depended upon that to which it was directed. For the Greek, the Voice of God spoke fitfully and inconsistently with itself even when they were ready to hear it: for the Jew, God had spoken through Moses and the prophets and was always the same, the one sure anchorage for the storm-tossed and disquieted souls of mortal men. And for the Jew this Hope was an essential part of the true man.

It is written in the Law, "And to Seth, to him also there was born a son, and he called his name Ēnosh ;

μυστήριόν μου ἐμοί. G. H. Box renders the Hebrew thus: "From Earth's bounds we have heard songs of praise: 'Honour (comes) to the righteous.' But I say: I pine! I pine! Woe is me." I believe that the Septuagint-translator thought any reference to pining inappropriate to the picture of a world first purged and then converted to Judaism, and transferred it to those who set the law at nought (καὶ ἐροῦσιν Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν· οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον). Theodotion evades the difficulty by taking the Hebrew root in its Aramaic sense.

then began men to call upon the name of the Lord ^a." In the Septuagint version, which was the Bible of Jews and their converts in the Greek world, this origin of religion is directly assigned to Enos, and the statement is transformed into an assertion of his Hope or Confidence: "He hoped to call upon the name of the Lord God." Philo accepts this variation, and finds in it the characteristic quality of this patriarch and the lesson of his life:

Here is sound doctrine. What could be more proper to the true man than Hope and the expectation of the acquisition of good things from the One God who loves giving? Here then is the only real generation or creation of man. Those who do not hope on God are not endowed with a rational nature ^b.

And so he combines with it the preface of the following chapter, which in the Masoretic text is, "This is the book of the generations of Adam ^c."

So far he speaks for Catholick Judaism. Man's first duty is absolute Hope or Confidence in the true God, without insistence upon any definite object. But as Philo writes in Greek and is affected by the current methods of interpretation, he gives way to the etymology and says elsewhere ^d:

He who hopes, as the very name shews, is deficient—*elpis* is *ellipēs*—he is always aspiring after goodness but has never yet been able to

^a Gen. iv. 26, R.V.

^b I. p. 218 Mangey.

^c Gen. v. 1, R.V.

^d II. p. 8 Mangey.

attain to it, like mariners who cannot make their haven.

Formally, Philo is led to insist upon this imperfection of Hope by the order of the triad—Enos, Enoch, Noah, who represent the three stages of Hope, Repentance, and Righteousness in man's upward progress^e. He holds, further, that these are the common ancestors of all mankind, and that Judaism began with Abraham, who with Isaac and Jacob represents a holier triad. It may well be the case that he regarded the definition of things hoped for as a shortcoming and a degradation of the ideal. The Hope of the Zealots and the Hopes of the false prophets are indeed on a lower plane. But Hope in God, affected as little as may be by the weakness of our mortal nature, is, as he says, the Fountain and Source of life.

His Greek speech led him astray from the true Jewish conception, but it had also unlocked for him the treasures of Greek wisdom, and thence he was able with the help of the Stoics to restore Hope to its proper place on the throne of the Stoic virtue of *Rightmindedness* or *Confidence*^f:

Good men receive Joy and Hope as their happy lot, and so must either possess or at

^e *De praemiis* 10 ff. (II. p. 410 ff. Mangey).

^f εὐθυμία: see Philo, *de Josepho* 113 (II. p. 57 Mangey): εὐθυμία χρώμενοι τῇ σιτίων ἀμείνονι τροφῇ—τρέφει γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα ἐλπίς—ἐπικουφίσωσι τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐνδείας βαρεῖαν νόσον—refers to Joseph's provision against famine (Genesis xli.).

worst expect good things, whereas evil men whose head-centre is Cain are always in pain and fear ^g.

The deficiency of the Greek word leads him to strengthen it, when he speaks of the unconscious homicides finding *Goodhopefulness*^h in the cities of refuge—he thinks perhaps of the fickle, fluctuating hopes of Greek converts—, but, on the whole, he is content with the simple *Elpis* and uses it after the fashion of the Septuagint as the equivalent of the Rabbis' *Assurance*—the confident Hope in God that God will not overlook the men He made.

This Assurance, this Hope seems to be the main-spring of Catholick Judaism. It is easy to lay stress upon the superficial differences of the different branches of what is, by this time, ancient Jewish literature. Philo wrote in Greek, and the Rabbis who represent for us the Judaism which they alone maintained after the final destruction of the Temple, wrote or spoke in Hebrew. The Rabbis were concerned to bequeath to posterity their decisions on nice points of law: Philo addressed himself to the Greek world at large, to the Jew first but also to such Gentiles as had some tincture of Greek philosophy. But, just as the Talmudists and the Scribes, whose decisions they reported, could not possibly have maintained the living faith of Judaism through the darkest hours the Jews had known since

^g *Quod deterior* 140 (p. 218 Mangey).

^h ἐυελπιστία: *quis rerum* 206 (p. 502 Mangey).

the persecution of Antiochus, without a common and unceasing insistence upon the weightier matters of the Law; so Philo visibly descends from his loftiest flights of meditation and speculation to warn his readers that they must not lose touch with their mother-earth—the faith with its outward observances through which they drew their strength from God.

The redactors of the Talmud have dealt hardly with the great religious teachers of the early centuries of this era. They presumed that it would be as obvious to posterity as it was to themselves, that the verdicts of the Rabbis could not possibly be full-length portraits, and speaking likenesses of these Judges of Israel, who brought their people out of the Promised Land into the Ghettos of an alien and unfriendly world, with no Temple, but only the Law—the Law and the Prophets—to help them bind the scattered Synagogues into a Nation. It was a harder task than was laid upon the ancient Judges—even Samuel—but they performed it. And it was not a task which could be performed solely by legal decisions, many of which dealt with the complexities of obsolete laws, and were of a merely academical interest.

These decisions have been singled out as the essential characteristic of the Scribes, and their religion has been branded as “barren legalism.” And it is of course difficult for persons, who have relegated religion to “its proper place,” to understand men who lived with the fear of God con-

tinually before their eyes and sought to obey God's Law rather than the common law of the state. Judaism covered the whole of a man's life, and the Scribes endeavoured to fulfil its requirements themselves, in order to make themselves examples to their flocks.

But even in the written records of Judaism there are fragments of wisdom and insight into the true value and meaning of life, which give fleeting glimpses of the Hope which sustained these men in their extremity. Here a little and there a little, the reader of the Mishnah (for example) learns to piece together the men behind the verdicts, which may be no concern of his. And now Dr. Schechter has made English readers free of this part of the Mishnah and the rest of Rabbinism in *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*—Theology being for the Jew synonymous with personal religion.

If it is easy to be deaf to hints and to disregard fragments of the real life which the Jews lived (and did not talk about) under the care of the Scribes, it is at any rate impossible to ignore their achievements. They rest from their labours, but their work survived them. If legalism was all their tools, it was *not* barren. Shakespeare mocked at Shylock to please his audience, but at least he let him say : "Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions?" St. Paul was content to work for the reunion of the "Christian" section of Judaism with its mother-church, and Robert Browning gives a

convincing picture of the Jewish mind upon this matter :

The Lord will have mercy on Jacob yet,
And again in his border see Israel set.
When Judah beholds Jerusalem,
The stranger-seed shall be joined to them.
To Jacob's House shall the Gentiles cleave.
So the Prophet saith and his sons believe.

God spoke and gave us the word to keep,
Bade never fold the hands nor sleep
'Mid a faithless world,—at watch and ward
Till Christ at the end relieve our guard.
By his servant Moses the watch was set :
Though near upon cock-crow, we keep it yetⁱ.

But happily we are not dependent upon a poet's imagination or Talmudic fragments for a notion of the Jewish Rabbi. Josephus was a professed Pharisee and wrote out the history of the Nation—partly to convince the hotheads that Rome was irresistible, and partly to create a less unintelligent and unsympathetic attitude toward the Jews in the minds of his Roman patrons. But Philo, who also wrote in Greek and at length, wrote out his own

ⁱ Dramatic Romances, *Holy-Cross Day* xiii., xv. I omit the intervening stanza because the metaphor "When the slaves enslave" being transferred to the future and occurring in a description of Jew-baiting might be misinterpreted. It is, of course, to be taken in the same sense as in *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit*. But the whole poem ought to be read.

history to the extent of including even some of the things that actually happened to him at a given time and place. And Philo was a Rabbi, a typical Rabbi, though he used a different language and a different idiom of expression from those of the Scribes of Palestine or Babylon. He talked Greek and talked it like the Greeks around him. He donned the very motley gown of philosophy—they were all philosophers and professed philosophers in Alexandria then, just as later the very barbers put Arianism to music when they all called themselves theologians. But he did not wear the motley cloak in his brain, and it need not hide his mind and heart from his readers. It does not lie within the scope of his extant works to enlarge upon the little details which make for a precise fulfilment of the Levitical laws of purity. There were ceremonial laws to be observed before one could enter the Temple at Jerusalem and so on. But Philo lived in Alexandria side by side with those whom he strove to win or keep for the religion of his fathers. Some were ready to sit loose to the letter of the Law, but he upheld the safeguards of Circumcision and Sabbath, always inculcating, and always with a text to back his pleading, the paramount duty of purity in deed and word and thought which God required of every one who professed to worship Him.

It is, of course, possible to say that the Talmuds and kindred works are formally post-Christian and, therefore, irrelevant to the study of Judaism as it

was when Christianity was born; and that Philo was an Alexandrian Jew, superficially very different from the Jews of Palestine. But modern labels are not infallible, and mnemonic distinctions of this kind obscure facts of far greater importance than those on which they insist. There was a Catholick Judaism common to the Jews of Alexandria and the Jews of Palestine or Babylon, common to the Nazarene heretics and the Pharisees, common even to the Essenes and the Sadducees, so far as they still deserved the name of Jews. The feasts at Jerusalem welded together the sojourners in foreign lands, whose different environment was a far more serious danger to unity than the differences of opinion which separated them into nominal sects. They were all united by their hope in God—all *Elpistici* (to borrow the title which Plutarch^k wastes upon some school of Greek philosophers) men who reckoned life without Hope intolerable.

But, if the Talmud is to be added to Philo and both admitted as representative of Catholick Judaism, there are other authorities to hand in the books of the New Testament and in the Apocalyptic literature which broadly speaking covers the period from Antiochus Epiphanes to Hadrian. Of these the Four Gospels—it is wanton frivolity to exclude the Fourth Gospel from consideration in *this* connexion,

^k *Quaestionum convivium* iv. 4: ὥπερ οὖν οἱ προσαγορευθέντες Ἐλπιστικοὶ φιλόσοφοι συνεκτικώτατον εἶναι τοῦ βίου τὸ ἐλπίζειν ἀποφαινεται, τῷ ἀπούσης ἐλπίδος οὐδ' ἡδυνούσης οὐκ ἀνεκτὸν εἶναι τὸν βίον . . .

at any rate—and the Epistles of St. Paul, who remained a Pharisee all his life by his own confession, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is as completely Alexandrine in expression as Philo, are the most important witnesses to the Judaism from which the Christian Church was to separate itself in due time. The Apocalyptic literature, with which the Revelation of St. John the Divine must be classed, is apt to be misunderstood by those who forget that words have not the same force and power when they are translated into another tongue. Some attempt at orientation is necessary, before the real intent of such writers discloses itself.

Suppose for the moment that all alphabets are derived from a common original, whose component parts were not conventional signs but faithful pictures of things which everyone could recognise at sight; suppose (let us say) that in this original alphabet A was represented by an Ass, B by a Bear, C by a Calf, D by a Demon, E by an Earwig, F by a Fox, and so on; suppose that all modern alphabets have developed on different lines and yet have in every symbol some distinctive feature of the original picture to which they correspond; it is clear each alphabet can be read at sight by anyone who knows the significance of those original pictures, and that anything expressed by means of the original pictures can be read by those who are habituated to any one of the derivative alphabets. Anyone, therefore, who had a message for those outside the range of

his own alphabet, would have recourse to the common original ; and the process of translating his message into that primitive universal script would inevitably tend to purge that message of anything local or accidental or even incidental. He might be telling a concrete piece of local or personal history (for example), but the translation would change the particular into the universal and emphasize the Philosophy which his History really exemplified.

For whatever reason and after whatever examples, the Jewish apocalyptic writers did something of this kind. The past and the present experience of the Nation was the stuff on which their minds worked in their visions. They stated what they could discern of God's plan and purpose in these happenings, which alone revealed, however dimly, the verdicts God passed upon His Chosen People. They were His people—the past generations were linked inseparably with the present—and He was their God, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Their history, past and present, was in their eyes an acquisition to be preserved as the only guide they had for the future, and to be preserved in such a form as would be intelligible to their successors. They interpreted Jewish history—to them the most obvious example of God's ways with men—in much the same way as the tragic dramatists of Athens interpreted the beliefs and even (as in the *Persae* of Aeschylus) the history of the Greeks. They could see that Jeshurun waxed fat

and kicked, that satiety bred insolent rebellion ; and they could see that the oppressors of Jeshurun, who were sent to punish his presumption, were not exempt from the self-same doom. And as they clothed the past in fantastic figures because there was need for secrecy, or because the picture-language was the proper medium for such revelations of God's purpose in events, so they envisaged the unknown future also. Past and future were meaningless terms to the writers of revelations like these. They were inspired to review the affairs of men from the steps of the throne of God, with whom a thousand years are as a day. While the Scribe laboured painfully to win or keep a people pledged to accept the rule of God, the Seer from his lofty watch-tower looked deep down into the bottom of the surging maelstrom of this present life, and descried the triumph which must await such painful endeavour. For the time of his vision he saw "the good and glory consummated thence," and then he descended to take his place among the toilers.

Modern scholars with a turn for epigram speak (in modern language) of the Scribes as looking for *evolution* and the Seers as expecting *revolution* in the affairs of men. It is a pretty play on words ; but it does not put the Seers and the Scribes into different camps. Nor does their weird vocabulary put the Seers outside the line of succession, by which the Scribes could claim the right to sit on

Moses' seat. Evolution issues in revolution. Evolution is growth viewed from the human standpoint. Soar aloft as the Seer did, and you may see the tree spring from the acorn full-grown in a moment of time. It is only a question of your point of view.

Dr. Schechter in his *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* ignores Philo altogether, and of the Apocalyptic writers he says¹:

The Psalms of Solomon may, for want of a better title, be characterized as the Psalms of the Pharisees; but to derive from them a Rabbinic theology is simply absurd. They have not left the least trace in Jewish literature, and it is most probable that none of the great authorities we are acquainted with in the Talmud had ever read a single line of them, or even had heard their name. The same is the case with other Apocryphal and Apocalyptic works, for which Rabbinism is often made responsible. However strange it may seem, the fact remains that whilst these writings left a lasting impress on Christianity, they contributed—with the exception, perhaps, of the Book of Ecclesiasticus—little or nothing towards the formation of Rabbinic thought. The Rabbis were either wholly ignorant of their very existence, or stigmatised them as fabulous, or “external”

¹ pp. 4, 5.

(a milder expression in some cases for heretical), and thus allowed them to exert no permanent influence upon Judaism.

The result of this attitude is that Dr. Schechter finds himself "almost entirely deprived of any real contemporary evidence from the most important period in the history of Rabbinic Theology." Such a statement provokes the respectful suggestion that in further studies of Rabbinic Theology—Dr. Schechter lays stress on the *some aspects* of his title—he might well exploit and explore Philo, the New Testament, and even these Apocalyptic and Apocryphal writings. For there are welcome signs that Jewish scholars are beginning to study even the Gospels, and the harvest is not yet.

Meanwhile one may surely contend that to refuse the evidence of any of the four authorities, the pre-Christian Apocalyptic, the Christian documents, Philo, the non-Christian contemporary of Jesus Christ, and the post-Christian compilations of the Talmud and Targums is to depart from the standard of Christian scholarship set by such men as John Lightfoot and Johannes Jacobus Wetstenius. The fact that Judaism survived the Christian Apostasy is not explained by the facile justification of ignorant Anti-semitism—"all good Jews were converted by St. Paul, as for the rest" St. Paul had his own theory about the worth of "the rest," and long before him it was said in the name of Ben Sira^m:

^m Ecclesiasticus (A.V.) xxxiii. 10—13, 15.

All men are from the ground, and Adam was created of earth. In much knowledge hath the Lord divided them, and made their ways diverse. Some of them hath he blessed and exalted, and some of them hath he sanctified and set near Himself: but some of them he cursed and brought low and turned out of their standings. As the clay is in the potter's hand to fashion it at his pleasure; so man is in the hand of him that made him to render to them as it liketh him best. . . . So look upon all the works of the most High; and there are two and two, one against the other.

And some Christian—a Jew for all the veneer of Alexandria—said ⁿ:

Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering (for he is faithful that promised); and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works.

The Content of the Jewish Hope.

All these authorities, Philo the reputed philosopher, absorbed in abstract speculations, and the Seers who dreamed, it is said, of concrete supernatural interference, are sometimes set aside by students of Rabbinism as temporary aberrations. Dr. Schechter (for example) finds no trace of their influence except in Christianity. But the verdict

ⁿ Hebrews (A.V.) x. 23, 24.

is justified only if the letter, and not the spirit, of these teachers be taken into sole account. At bottom both the Seers and Philo shared the Hope of Judaism, and either looked or worked for its fulfilment. Before the Mishnah was compiled (Dr. Schechter puts it at 200 C.E.) the Jew was at feud with the Greek: both Philo and the Seers were taken over by the Christian Church which had ceased to be a branch of Judaism. But so far as the Mishnah and the rest are concerned, it is surely more true to say that these discarded teachers, who at any rate had served their generation, had been absorbed before they were repudiated. How far the philosophical methods and ideas, with which Philo and his predecessors adorned their Judaism, affected later Jewish philosophy, others must determine; but it is plain enough that even the manner and vocabulary of the Apocalyptic literature was taken over into Rabbinic—witness the description of the reign of Salome Alexandra. Like St. Paul and other Christians they also are entitled to say to the Rabbis, *Brethren*, it is for *the Hope* I am called in question.

Taking, then, all four groups of authorities into consideration, it is clear that the Hope of Catholick Judaism is primarily a state of Confidence in God, and so far as it is legitimately and really an expectation of anything at all, it is always the expectation of the Sovereignty or Reign of God, which can only be set up by a Prophet and necessarily results in public and private peace.

It must be remembered that the Kingdom of God had actually come within the historical period of Jewish history. Whatever the Jews who lived under Moses and Samuel thought of their constitution, their successors regarded it as a *theocracy*. They had no earthly king at all, and obeyed—or disobeyed—the commands of God, which were delivered to them by the mouth of His prophet. When they insisted that they must have a king like other nations, Samuel received this word of the Lord^o: “It is not thou whom they have rejected, *but it is I whom they have rejected from being King over them.*” Their request was of a piece with their general infidelity, which God had tolerated since the day that He brought them up out of Egypt. And their reception or rejection of the prophet was the reception or rejection of God, whose instrument or voice he was.

The theocracy—this government by an inspired prophet—was established by Moses.

Some lawgivers (Josephus says^p) instituted monarchies, some oligarchies, some democracies; but our lawgiver proclaimed the state to be a theocracy, ascribing the government and the power to God. He persuaded us all to look to God as cause of all good things which either come to all mankind generally or are bestowed upon them when they pray to Him

^o 2 Sam. viii. 7.

^p *Against Apion* II. 16 (Niese, §§ 165—172).

in their distress. He taught us that no deed, not even any thought, can escape God's notice. He declared that God was One God, uncreate and eternally incapable of change or variableness, surpassing in beauty every human conception of the deity, known to us by His power but unknowable in His essence⁹. The wisest of the Greeks, Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, and Plato, the Stoics and almost all the philosophers, learned this truth from Moses: yet they had but few disciples and dared not unfold the truth of their doctrine to the many who were pre-occupied with mere opinions. But our lawgiver, whose actions were consistent with his words, persuaded his entire generation, and, what is more, inspired in all who should come after them this faith concerning God past all dislodgement, thanks to his comprehensive legislation which included customs as well as commands, and made piety co-extensive with virtue in the widest sense of the term.

Josephus could have justified his boast historically. There were always some Jews who refused to bow the knee to the Baal of their generation, in spite of the despair of their prophets. But the disobedience and apostasy of even one Jew was proof that the Reign of God was not fully established

⁹ ἓνα αὐτὸν ἀπέφηνε καὶ ἀγέννητον καὶ πρὸς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον ἀναλλοίωτον πάσης ιδέας θνητῆς κάλλει διαφέροντα καὶ δυνάμει μὲν ἡμῶν γινώριμον, ὁποῖος δὲ κατ' οὐσίαν ἄγνωστον.

even over the Chosen People. And outside the pale, God's authority was openly flouted. Pharaoh said, "Who is the Lord that I should obey His voice?"—and even when the Israelites obeyed their prophet to a man, the Theocracy was not paramount over all the earth.

As the Rabbis read the history, the reign of God was proclaimed in the Song of thanksgiving for the passage of the Red Sea^r.

"*Then* sang Moses." The word *then* is also written in the Psalms^s: "Thy throne is established from *then*." Rabbi Berachiah said in the name of Rabbi Abuhu: Though Thou wast from eternity yet was not Thy rule acknowledged in the earth until Thy children sang this song. For it is written, Thy throne is established from *then*. It is like a king who went to war and conquered, and then was made Augustus. . . . So said the Israelites: "Though Thou wast from eternity the same ere the world was created, yet Thy throne was not established and Thou wast not known. When Thou hadst created it, Thou wast known as *standing*," as it is written^t: He *stood* and measured the earth. But when Thou didst stand by the sea and we sang a song unto

^r Shemoth Rabba xxxiii (on Exodus xv. 1).

^s Psalm xciii. 2.

^t Habakkuk iii. 6.

Thee, *then* was Thy Kingdom established and Thy throne was firmly set ^u.

The real basis of this idea is not simply the recurrence of the word *then* in the statement of the Psalmist. The Passage of the Red Sea was the typical deliverance of Israel; and it was the means by which they won their way to Mount Sinai, where they declared with one voice ^x, "All that the Lord hath said we will do and be obedient." It was only an afterthought which led the Rabbis to seek out various passages of Scripture to legitimise the truth they detected in the Song, for in it the words occur, "*The Lord shall reign for ever and ever.*"

If the Masoretic text represents the original, as seems most probable, it was natural enough that the future tense should be employed. There is justice in the idea which it suggests, that Israel being delivered from the Egyptian bondage pledged themselves to obey their Deliverer and so provided Him thenceforward with loyal subjects. But the commentators, remembering how often the promise implied in the words had been broken, were ready to cavil at the tense and even to emend it. The subsequent behaviour of Israel was enough to prove that they had relegated the fulfilment of their pledge to an indefinite future and the correction to the present was made by R. Jose of Galilee. In the Septuagint

^u Schechter (*Some Aspects*, p. 85) gives "in the hour when we stood by the Red Sea."

^x Exodus xxiv. 7.

the present participle is used perhaps under the influence of some Aramaic paraphrase (such as that of Onkelos) which used the participle to express the present tense ; but this makes it possible to take the crucial statement as part of the title.

It is worth while to examine Philo's comments^y on this important passage partly for the sake of comparison with the method of the other Rabbis and partly for his clear exposition of the true meaning of God's Reign or Kingdom :

Moses in his compassion for those who are banished from the Garden of the Virtues, addresses to God as the absolute but also the merciful Ruler the prayer^z that those who have eyes to see^a may be planted there whence the earthly mind (which is Adam) had been driven out. It says :

Bring them in and plant them in the hill of thine inheritance to thy habitation which thou hast made ready, O Lord, the sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hands have prepared, Lord reigning through the age and for eternity and after . . .^b

^y *De plantatione*, §§ 46—53, I. pp. 336, 337 Mangey.

^z Μωυσῆς (*sic*) δὲ οἰκτιζόμενος τοὺς μετανάστας ἐκ τοῦ τῶν ἀρετῶν παραδείσου γεγονότας καὶ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος καὶ τὰς ἰλεως αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμέρους δυνάμεις εὐχεται. The different Powers of God are the several conceptions of the One to which men of different degrees of proficiency respectively attain. A merely literal translation of such passages is misleading.

^a Israel = Man-seeing God.

^b Exodus xv. 17, 18: Philo agrees with the Septuagint as edited,

The hill of thine inheritance is this world, and Moses prays that we may be so planted in it that we be not false to our reason, irrational and disobedient, but follow the guidance of its Final and Perfect Cause, copying the invariable consistency of its processes, and so lead a sober and godly life without faltering. For the ancients said that to be able to live in accordance with Nature was the height of happiness^c.

This, the first and not the final interpretation of the text, is more Stoic than Jewish. It gives the moral teaching to be deduced; but it does not appeal to God's revelation of Himself to the prophets and, through them, to the Scribes of Israel as the Father of each and all of them in the special sense that He had also revealed to them His Law which the Stoics could only infer from observation of nature. And so Philo proceeds to the religious teaching which had already been stated by his predecessors.

except that he puts *κατειργάσω* for *κατηρτίσω*: the variant is attested by the note *κατείργασθαι καὶ μὴ ἀγένητον εἶναι* below.

^c οὐκοῦν σαφέστατα εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος ἔμαθεν, ὅτι τὰ σπέρματα καὶ τὰς ῥίζας ἀπάντων καθελὺς ὁ θεὸς αἰτιὸς ἐστὶ τοῦ τὸ μέγιστον ἀναβλαστῆσαι φυτὸν, τόνδε τὸν κόσμον, ὃν καὶ νῦν ἔοικεν αἰνίττεσθαι δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ λεχθέντος ἄσματος "ὅρος" αὐτὸν "κληρονομίας" εἰπών· ἐπειδὴ τοῦ πεποιηκότος οἰκελοτάτον τὸ γενόμενον κτῆμα καὶ κληρος, εὔχεται οὖν ἡμᾶς ἐν τούτῳ φυτευθῆναι, οὐχ ἵνα ἄλογοι καὶ ἀφηνιασταὶ γενώμεθα τὰς φύσεις, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐπόμενοι τῇ τοῦ τελειοτάτου διοικήσει τὴν κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχουσιν αὐτοῦ διέξοδον ἀπομιμούμενοι σώφρονι καὶ ἀπταιστώ βίῃ χρώμεθα· τὸ γὰρ ἀκολουθία φύσεως ἰσχύσαι ζῆν εὐδαιμονίας τέλος εἶπον οἱ πρῶτοι.

But in order that no one should suppose that the Creator and Maker of all things is in need of anything which was made, Moses will add that most necessary title, that art king through the age and for eternity and beyond ; for a king needs nothing of anyone, but his subjects are dependent on him for everything ^d.

But some have said that it is the Chief Good which is, and is called, God's *portion*, for the use and enjoyment of which Moses here prays on behalf of his people. He says (in effect) ^e :

We are like children just beginning to learn : school us by the doctrines and theorems of wisdom, leave us not illiterate, but plant us in the house of high and heavenly Reason. For this is the readiest portion, the house best fitted for us to inhabit, which thou hast made holy. For thou, O Master, art Maker of things good and holy, as corruptible creation is the maker of things evil and profane. *Reign, then, through eternity as king*

^d βασιλέα δὲ οὐδενὸς δεῖσθαι, τὰ δὲ ὑπήκοα βασιλέως θέμις πάντα : “ it is the established order of things that . . . ”

^e εἰσαγαγὼν, γὰρ φησιν, ἡμᾶς οἷα παῖδας ἄρτι μαθάνειν ἀρχομένους διὰ τῶν σοφίας δογμάτων καὶ θεωρημάτων καὶ μὴ ἀστοιχειώτους ἐάσας ἐν ὑψηλῷ καὶ οὐρανίῳ λόγῳ καταφύτευσον. κληῖρος γὰρ οὗτος ἐτοιμότατος καὶ προχειρότατος οἶκος, ἐπιτηδεύσις ἐνδιαίτημα, ὃ “ κατειργάσω ἅγιον ” ἀγαθῶν γὰρ καὶ ἁγίων, ᾧ δέσποτα, ποιητὴς ὢν τυγχάνεις, ὥς ἔμπαλιν κακῶν καὶ βεβήλων γένεσις ἢ φθαρτή. βασιλεὺς δὴ τὸν ἄπειρον αἰῶνα ψυχῆς τῆς ἱκέτιδος μηδὲ ἀκαρὲς ἔων αὐτὴν ἀνηγεμόνευτον· ἡ γὰρ ἀδιάστατος παρὰ σοὶ δουλεία τῆς μεγίστης ἀρχῆς, οὐκ ἐλευθερίας μόνον αὐτείνων.

over the suppliant soul, and never leave it for a moment free from thy governance ; for unbroken servitude under thee is better than freedom, yea better than a world-dominion.

It is important to notice that Philo introduces his explanatory paraphrase with the formula, *He says* or *It says*, proper to the words of the Scripture themselves ; just as in the Rabbinic writings interpretations of the sayings are given by the interpreter speaking *in the name of* the original speaker. Philo certainly influenced the patristic commentators ; and it is at least possible that they followed him in this respect also. Generally, this piece of exegesis is typical of his method and his objects. The history of the patriarchs is preserved "for our sake." They are types by which the individual may measure himself, and estimate his advance in the moral and religious life of the soul. Like the Talmudists, Philo is concerned to treat the individual, and he shews plainly here what the Sovereignty of God meant to the Rabbis. Each Jew took upon himself the yoke of the Sovereignty of God, when he recited his daily confession of faith in the One God ; and it was the Rabbis' duty to see that each man under their care did actually submit himself to that yoke in all things. And he rejoices as heartily as any Talmudist or Psalmist in the happiness of complete obedience to the Law of God, "whose service is perfect freedom"—and more. Of the distant future, present to the inspired vision of the Seer, when all should

thus obey, he speaks elsewhere; but, for the most part, he fulfils his appointed task of establishing the Kingdom of God in each individual he could reach.

But to return to the history of Israel, it was only fitfully that they obeyed the will of God revealed by His prophet Moses. There was always a righteous remnant, but the others rebelled again and again. Without dwelling upon the notorious lapses the Rabbis were content to say:

In the days of Joshua the Son of Nun, Israel received upon themselves the kingdom of heaven in love . . . and their reward was that God regarded them as pupils in the house of their Teacher^f, and children gathered round the table of their father, and he apportioned to them a blessing.

And then again:

In the times of the prophet Samuel, Israel received upon themselves the kingdom of heaven in fear . . . and their reward was that God came down from the upper heavens, the place of His glory . . . and abode with them during the battle and apportioned to them a blessing^g.

^f Compare Philo's comment on Exodus xv. 17, quoted above.

^g Schechter, *Some Aspects*, p. 87, from *Bemidbar Rabba* 7. 2, and *Seder Eliahu*, p. 86.

Between Moses and Samuel lies the period of the Judges. The Nation was disobedient, and was punished for their defection. But God, having adopted them as His son, sent deliverers, and finally a prophet like Moses in the person of Samuel, so that His Sovranty was once more fully established.

At what date the history of the Nation was interpreted in this sense we cannot say. Some modern scholars are inclined to assign the final editing of the Law to the time of Ezra. But early or late this reading of the past affected and shaped the national view of the future. The Pentateuch, which (as Josephus observes) contains provisions for the whole conduct of life and makes all virtues parts of the religion, survived to mould their Hope of the time when they should have suffered their due punishment and God should restore them.

It appears, then, that the full Theocracy demands a faithful prophet like Moses or Samuel, and that, since the present is the daughter of the past, the Nation might well expect a series of deliverers, who should relieve them from their successive oppressors. But whatever may be thought of Moses the Arch-prophet, who affects posterity and disappears mysteriously, these Judges or deliverers do no more than serve their own generation. And, in the absence of a living prophet, the Nation must clearly have recourse to previous revelations in the hope that by their belated obedience they may be fit for the restoration of the Theocracy.

Out of their ancient history the prophets, sages and scribes derived categories and titles for their future deliverers, as they felt the need of them. When there was no prophet at hand, the Word of God was precious. So here and there, at one time and another, the Hope was variously defined, and many of the definitions were preserved. The essential thing was always the prophet who should be the passive instrument of God's revelation, and speak nothing from his own mouth^h. As for his titles, they were only titles, and there was, for long enough, no attempt to combine them into a consistent whole.

After all, the Hope was essentially Confidence in God, and God's ways are not men's ways. Perhaps God might send another Elijah or another David. But no man except a prophet could predict what agent He would choose. If the various promises contained in the Law and prophets were added and not fused together the different ideals were arranged in succession.

Half a century before the beginning of the common era it would seem that a general title capable of covering many, if not all, the special titles assigned to the unknown viceroy of the invisible God, was adopted in some quarters. Hence we speak commonly of the *Messianic Hope*.

^h Jeremiah xxiii. 16.

CHAPTER II.

THE TITLE MESSIAH OR CHRIST.

[T is a surprising fact that, whereas the Christians asserted and the Jews denied that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, and whereas the Christians were known to the world as *Christians*, *Messiah's partisans*, as soon as they were distinguished from ordinary Jews; nevertheless, the representative of God, whom the Jews continued to expect, is still called Messiah in the Rabbinic literature. It is true that Israel had withdrawn to its tents: the Jews had retreated from their endeavour to leaven and convert the Greek-speaking world: the Septuagint was replaced by the new version of Aquila and its origin was regarded as a regrettable incident instead of the beginning of a new epoch, worthy to be commemorated by a feast and to be embroidered with mythical elucidations of its place in God's plan. But this is not enough to explain the fact.

Allowance must be made for the severance of Jew and Greek, which obscured the identity of *Christ* and *Messiah*. When the fence^a which barred the

^a This is *the middle-wall of the fence* (τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ) of *Ephesians* ii. 14. Josephus, *Jewish War* v. 5. 2 (§§ 193, 194 Niese) describes it thus: διὰ τούτου (the outer court) προΐόντων ἐπὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἱερὸν δρύφακτος περιβέβλητο λίθινος, τρίπηχυν μὲν ὕψος, πάνυ

Gentile from nearer approach to the Holy Place at Jerusalem was torn down, the old tendency of the Jews to isolation and separation from the Gentiles rose up in its place, and gradually established itself, wherever they might be. But so long as Jews—like Josephus (for example)—mingled in Greek society they were (or so it seems to us at this distance of time) likely to meet the name *Christian* applied to the sect which they preferred to designate in other ways. Nero did his best to make the name known after the Fire of Rome in A.D. 64^b: on the other hand, in 112 A.D. Pliny says that he had never been present at the trial of a Christian^c. Probably we are inclined to exaggerate their prominence out of all relation to facts as they were.

Then there is another consideration: *Christus* was

δὲ χαριέντως διειργασμένος· ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ εἰστήκεσαν ἐξ Ἰσοῦ διαστήματος
 στήλαι τὸν τῆς ἀγγελίας προσημαίνουσαι νόμον αἱ μὲν Ἑλληνικοῖς αἱ δὲ
 Ρωμαϊκοῖς γράμμασιν μηδένα ἀλλόφυλον ἐντὸς τοῦ ἁγίου παριέναι· τὸ γὰρ
 δεύτερον ἱερὸν ἅγιον ἐκαλεῖτο. One of these inscriptions is now in
 the public museum at Constantinople, and Dittenberger (*Orientalis
 Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae* ii. pp. 294, 295) gives it with an
 account of its discovery: 598 Lapis calcarius durissimus quod lapidis
 genus indigenae *Mizé-Jahudi* appellant, rectangulus, quem Clermont-
 Ganneau repperit muro immissum, ita ut versus scripturae deorsum
 current, et maxima ex parte in terra latentem in schola (*medresse*)
 parva deserta et paene dilapsa in oppido Hierosolymis prope viam
 dolorosam quem dicunt . . . μηδένα ἀλλογενῇ εἰσπορεύεσθαι ἐντὸς τοῦ
 περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τρυφάκτου καὶ περιβόλου, ὃς δ' ἂν ληφθῇ ἐαυτῶς αἷτιος
 ἔσται διὰ τὸ ἐξακολουθεῖν θάνατον. See also Josephus, *Antiquities* xv.
 11. 5 (§ 417 Niese), and *Jewish War* vi. 2. 4. (§§ 124—128 Niese).

^b Tacitus, *Annals* xv. 44.

^c Pliny to Trajan 96 (97) cognitionibus de Christianis interfui nunquam; ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri.

a very rare word in common Greek speech, and it was equivalent in sound to a very common word, *Chrestus*. The Jew or the instructed Christian might know the significance of the title which the latter gave to Jesus in a very special sense ; but the ordinary Greek, if he distinguished *Christus* from *Chrestus* at all, associated it with the art of Medicine, taking the word in the sense of *Unguent* or *Salve*^d. *Pharmacy*, the science of drugs, was a thing of bad odour to the Jews^e, because of its association with magic and idolatry ; and, just as Jesus ben Sira^f must defend the medical profession, so Philo^g held (in theory, at any rate) that it was an act of impiety to call in a doctor. But the ordinary Greek had no such prejudices against doctors or magic, and might well be

^d On Theocritus xi. 1 : There is no cure for love—no unguent (ἔγχριστον φάρμακον), no powder (ἐπίπαστον)—nothing but poetry ; the Scholiast quotes Cyclops as a case in point, and adds ἰστέον ὅτι τῶν φαρμάκων τὰ μὲν εἰσι Χριστὰ, ἡγουν ἅπερ χρίμεθα εἰς θεραπείαν· τὰ δὲ ποτὰ ἡγουν ἅπερ πίνομεν· τὰ δὲ ἐπίπαστα ἡγουν ἅπερ ἐπιπάττομεν.

^e St. Paul, *Galatians* v. 19, 20 : φανερά δέ ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς, ἃτινὰ ἐστίν, πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια, εἰδωλολατρία φαρμακία . . .

^f *Ecclesiasticus* xxxviii. 1—15 : Honour a physician according to thy need of him with the honours due unto him : for verily the Lord hath created him . . . He that sinneth before his Maker let him fall into the hands of the physician (R.V.).

^g Philo I. p. 176 Mangey. ἐπειδὴν γὰρ συμβῇ τι τῶν ἀβουλήτων, ἅτε μὴ πεπιστευκότες παγίως τῷ σωτῆρι θεῷ πρότερον καταφεύγουσιν ἐπὶ τὰς ἐν γενέσει βοηθείας, ἰατροὺς, βοτάνας, φαρμάκων συνθέσεις, διαίταν ἡκριβωμένην . . . καὶ ἄρα εἶπη τις· καταφεύγετε, ὦ μάταιοι, ἐπὶ τὸν μόνον ἱατρον ψυχῆς ἀρρωστημάτων μεθέμενοι τὴν ἀπὸ γενέσεως τῆς παθητῆς ψευδώνυμον ὠφέλειαν, γελῶσι καὶ χλευάζουσιν ἐπιφωνοῦντες· ταῦτα εἰς αἴριον (see Exodus viii. 9). And yet Philo seems to have had a medical training.

disposed to welcome the news of a new "Medicine-man" to supplement the failing powers of Aesculapius. So when St. Paul spoke to the Corinthians of himself and his fellow-Christians as the fragrance of Christ and the aroma (*osmè*) of life or death to the heathen^h, he may have had at the back of his own mind the Hebrew word for *spice*, SAMMIM, which means *drug* in later Hebrew and Aramaic; but his readers may have supplied another link for themselves, thinking of the aroma of *ointments*ⁱ, which were salutary for men but deadly to vultures^k.

But in all likelihood when a Greek (or a Roman familiar with Greek) heard the word *Christus*, he

^h 2 *Corinthians* ii. 14—17: τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ χριστῷ καὶ τὴν ὁσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν . . . ὅτι Χριστοῦ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ θεῷ ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, οἷς μὲν ὁσμὴ ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὁσμὴ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν . . . οὐ γὰρ ἐσμὲν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ (the quack-doctors) καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ . . . The introduction of the sweet savour of sacrifice helps to make clear his reference to the miraculous cures attributed to Aesculapius, &c., at their shrines. For the curative properties of odours, compare Philo, *de somniis* i. 51 (p. 628 Mangey): δεύτερα δ' οἴσονται, οἷς ἀπολαῦσαι μὲν οὐκ ἐξεγένετο τῆς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης, κνισσοῦν δὲ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ψυχὰς. αἵραις γὰρ ἀρετῆς οὗτοι ζωπυρρηθήσονται, καθάπερ τῶν καυνόντων οἱ παρειμένοι διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι τροφῇ χρῆσθαι τὰς εἰς ἀνάληψιν προσφέρονται ὁσμάς, ἅς ἰατρῶν παῖδες λιποθυμίας ἅκη σωτήρια προευντρεπίζονται.

ⁱ Compare John xii. 3: ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὁσμῆς τοῦ μύρου.

^k Aelian in his *de natura animalium* asserts that fragrance and perfume (εὐωδία καὶ μύρον) are fatal to vultures (iii. 7, iv. 18), and beetles (vi. 46). In his remarks on bees (i. 58) he clearly identifies the two words: ἀπεχθάνονται δὲ ἄρα αἱ μέλιτται κακοσμία πάσῃ καὶ μύρῳ ὁμοίως, οὔτε το δυσῶδες ὑπομένουσαι, οὔτε ἀσπαζόμεναι τῆς εὐωδίας τὸ τεθυρμμένον, οἷα δῆπου κόραι ἀστείαι τε καὶ σάφρονες, τὸ μὲν βδελυττόμεναι, τῆς δὲ ὑπερφρονοῦσαι.

wrote it down as *Chrestus* in the tablets of his mind, as Suetonius wrote it in his Life of Claudius. There is nothing more certain than that the scribes to whom we owe our manuscripts of Greek literature used the vowels I and \bar{E} indifferently, and that they preferred familiar to unfamiliar words, provided that they got a sense for their passage—always supposing that they understood it or wished to understand it.

Now *Chrestus* was a familiar word of everyday speech, and it had possibilities which could make it acceptable both to the partisans of Him, to whom it was applied and to their contemptuous opponents. Properly it means *good* or *kind* but (“evil communications corrupt good manners”) kindness to all, whether deserving and grateful or not, is often regarded as mistaken kindness and foolish simplicity. So the word which denoted loyal citizens, and which Jews and Christians applied to God Himself, was used to express contemptuous patronage—though less habitually in Greek literature than the word, which has etymologically a more definite safeguard, *well-mannered* or *well-disposed*¹.

It is not demonstrable that Suetonius^m referred to

¹ εὐήθης.

^m Suetonius, *Claudius* 25. 12: Iudaeos impulsore Chresto adsidue tumultuantes Roma expulit. Dio Cassius (lx. 6, p. 669) says that Claudius “found them too numerous to expel, and ordered that those who were born Jews should not assemble together: he also dissolved the Associations which had been formed during the reign of Caligula, and seeing that he could do nothing unless he altered the conditions

the preaching of Christ Crucified in Rome when he said that Claudius expelled the Jews because of constant riots, the responsibility for which was laid upon *Chrestus*. But, if *Chrestiani* in this sense of the word was the current designation of the Christians, Tacitus has embalmed it in a sentence which is worthy of his mordant witⁿ: "they were hated for their crimes and so the rabble called them *Chrestians*," the followers of the good, kind man. In fact the Roman populace—or Tacitus as their spokesman—did for the Christians what the Athenians did for Phocion—much to the bewilderment of Plutarch^o, who wrote his life :

Being what he was, I wonder how or why a man so rough and savage ever got the surname *Chrestus*. I suppose that it is not entirely impossible for a man to be at once sweet and harsh—just like a wine.

Tacitus and those who went bail for the kindliness of the Furies, when they were christened the Eumenides, would have credited Phocion's sponsors with something midway between an honest propitiation and an ironical jest.

But this is mere speculation. Long afterwards

of their daily life, he closed the shops where they met and drank, and forbade them to sell baked meats or hot water."

The latter general order illustrates, if it does not include, the special treatment of the Jews.

ⁿ *Annals* xv. 44.

^o *Phocion* 10: ὥστε θαυμάζειν ὕπως καὶ δπόθεν τραχὺς οὕτως ἀνὴρ καὶ συνθραπὸς ἐκτήσαστο τὴν τοῦ χρηστοῦ προσηγορίαν . . .

Tertullian^p gives plain evidence that the Christian sect, which had certainly attained to some notoriety by his time, was known even then by the name of the *Chrestiani*, and so well known that he appeals to the title in proof of their harmlessness.

We may take it, then, that the Hebrew *Messiah* was not contaminated for *believing* Jews (as the Jewish phrase still goes) by the appropriation of the Greek *Christus* to the sect of the Nazarenes, which soon broke off from the main body and inherited the missionary work of Judaism. The *Babylonian* Talmud speaks freely of *Messiah* in the manner of a proper name, and the *Palestinian* Talmud—the difference is important—speaks freely of *the Messiah of Jehovah*^a. For the content of this

^p *Apology* 3 : quae accusatio vocabulorum nisi si aut barbarum sonat aliqua vox nominis aut infaustum aut maledicum aut inpudicum? Christianus vero, quantum interpretatio est, de unctione deducitur. Sed et cum perperam Chrestianus pronuntiatur a vobis (nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos) de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est.

^a Dalman, *Words of Jesus* 289 ff. : “The Babylonian custom of using Messiah as a proper name is incapable of being verified in regard to Palestine.” Surely this points to the absence or insignificance of Christians in the Babylonian Dispersion. Philo (II. pp. 577, 578, Mangey) suggests that the legate who resisted Caligula’s order to set his statue in the Temple, feared the Jews of the country beyond the Euphrates—apparently more than the Jews scattered over the rest of the world and in Palestine : ἐφόβουν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ αἱ πέραν Εὐφράτου δυνάμεις· ἦδει γὰρ Βαβύλωνα καὶ πολλὰς ἄλλας τῶν σατραπειῶν ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων κατεχομένας, οὐκ ἀκοῇ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ πείρᾳ· καθ’ ἕκαστον γὰρ ἐνιαυτὸν ἱεροπομποὶ στέλλονται, χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον πλείστον κομίζοντες εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸν ἀθροισθέντα ἐκ τῶν ἀπαρχῶν, δυσβάτους καὶ ἀτριβεῖς καὶ ἀνηγύτους ὁδοὺς περαιούμενοι, ὥς λεωφόρους εἶναι νομίζουσιν ὅτι πρὸς

Messianic Hope it is a relief to be able to quote from Dr. Schechter a summary of "the fixed elements which are to be found in the Rabbinic literature of almost every age and date." Isolated and fragmentary sayings are likely to exaggerate some aspect of the whole and to embody particular applications of general principles in such a way as to lead to misjudgments.

The Rabbinic doctrine of the Messiah.

Dr. Schechter states his conclusions under four heads^r:

1. The faith that the Messiah, a descendant of the house of David, will restore the kingdom of Israel, which under his sceptre will extend over the whole world.

2. The notion that a last terrible battle will take place with the enemies of God (or of Israel), who will strive against the establishment of the kingdom, and who will finally be destroyed. "When will the Lord be King for ever and ever? When the heathen—that is, the Romans—will have perished out of the land."

3. The belief that the establishment of this new kingdom will be followed by the spiritual hegemony of Israel, when all nations will accept

εὐσεβείαν ἔχειν δοκοῦσι. Josephus wrote his history of the disastrous Jewish war in order to deter the Babylonians from rising.

^r *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, p. 102.

the belief in the unity of God, acknowledge his kingdom, and seek instruction from his law.

4. The conviction that it will be an age of material happiness as well as spiritual bliss for all those who are included in the kingdom, when further death will disappear and the dead will revive.

The language employed is redolent of the blood and fire, in which the local habitation of the Jews' religion disappeared before the temporary triumph of Antiochus Epiphanes, Titus, and the armies of Hadrian. Rome is the enemy. But the third and final destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian would seem to have convinced the general mind of the Jews once for all, that the reprisals of which they continued to speak were illegitimate and impossible except in the sphere of religion. They had the Prophets to teach them this lesson, and their authority was enhanced by events, and the facts of subsequent Jewish history prove that they accepted this teaching. Henceforth their warfare was with the powers of wickedness entrenched within the soul of man: "the Devil, Death, and the Evil of man's nature are one thing"; and, though they dreamed of material happiness, it was only as the husk and the outward sign of spiritual bliss.

Now if you find a thing in the Rabbinic literature the presumption is that it has its roots in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and that the connexion can be established by formal proof. In the

case of a title like Messiah the presumption is, also, that the meaning or meanings assigned to it by the Rabbis and their predecessors will be derived from *all* the occurrences of the word in the entire record of divine Revelation. And one Scripture led them on to another, which has no apparent relevance when the first is forgotten. In fact it is dangerous, and probably false, to say of any given passage that it was not "interpreted Messianically," before the Christian Apostles and Apologists so took it in their controversies with the Jews.

Messiahs in the Old Testament.

Now in the Old Testament the verb MSH, *anoint*, is used in reference to a multiplicity of God's messengers; and, therefore, the Messiah of the Rabbis was a composite portrait. Priests were consecrated to the service of God by the sacrament of unction, and among them the High-Priest: God said to Moses^s:

And thou shalt put the vestments upon Aaron thy brother and his sons with him; and shalt anoint them, and fill their hand and sanctify them that they may minister to me in the priest's office.

Now the idea of the High-Priest as mediator between God and man is independent of the Temple: it *stands written* in the Law. Philo says^t:

^s Exodus xxviii. 41.

^t *De fuga* 20, pp. 561, 562 Mangey.

The provision for the return of the fugitive homicides from the cities of refuge—the death of the high-priest—presents a difficulty, if it be taken literally, because it appoints a variable term of exile as their punishment. But the deeper sense resolves the difficulty. The high-priest is no man but a type of the Divine Word (*Logos*), and he is free of all sin voluntary or involuntary. For Moses says^u that he cannot defile himself for father or mother: and this, I suppose, because he is born of incorruptible and pure parents—his father being God who is also the father of all things, and his mother being Wisdom through whom the universe came into being—and because his head has been anointed with oil—that is, his inner self is illuminated with radiant light^x—so that he is reckoned worthy “to put on the vestments.”

And again^y:

The high-priest is blameless, complete, and the husband of a maiden^z. . . . And he is not merely a man, who is father of such servants of God as light the heavenly flames of piety in the world. He, their leader and father, has no ordinary place or part in the holy Congregation. When he stands alone, he is in himself the whole court

^u Leviticus xxi. 11.

^x λέγω δὲ τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν φωτὶ ἀγγοιδεῖ περιλάμπεται.

^y *De somniis* ii. 28, pp. 683, 684 Mangey.

^z Leviticus xxi. 17, 13.

of justice, the whole assembly, the whole people, the whole race of men, or rather, if the truth must be said, his nature is on the border-line between God and man, less than God but more than man^a. For Scripture says^b: “when the high-priest enters the Holy of Holies he shall not be a man.” What is he then? God? No. Only Moses the High-Prophet received this name, and when he was still in Egypt was called Pharaoh’s God^c. But he is not man. He touches both extremes—the foot and the head.

When Samuel was old and there was no prophet worthy to fill his place, God’s disaffected subjects grew impatient^d; and, after protest made, Samuel in accordance with a revelation^e anointed Saul saying, “Is it not the Lord hath anointed thee to be prince over His inheritance^f?” When Saul’s disobedience caused the Lord to repent of the choice—obedience to the voice of God as delivered by the Prophet was necessary to the continuance of the calling—Samuel was sent to anoint one of the sons of Jesse, and, as the eldest stood before him, he said—as the Jews were to say with agonies of hope deferred in after years—“Surely the Lord’s anointed

^a μεθόριός τις θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου φύσις τοῦ μὲν ἐλάττων τοῦ δὲ κρείττων.

^b Leviticus xvi. 17.

^c Exodus vii. 1.

^d 1 Samuel viii.

^e 1 Samuel ix. 15: the Septuagint keeps the Hebrew idiom: καὶ Κύριος ἀπεκάλυψεν τὸ ὄτιον Σαμουήλ . . .

^f 1 Samuel x. 1.

is here in His presence ^g." But the youngest, a mere lad, had been chosen and Samuel anointed David, because he was good in the sight of the Lord ^h.

David, though he broke God's commandments, was obedient to the prophet Nathan when God spoke by his voice ⁱ, and finally of the wife, whom he had sinned to gain, a son was born to him after his punishment—"And she called his name Solomon. And the Lord loved him; and he sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet; and he called his name Jedidiah, *the beloved of Jehovah*, by the word of the Lord ^k."

When Solomon came to the throne, the House of God was built, the people had rest, and the Lord renewed to him the promise by virtue of which he had succeeded David ^l. But his descendants did not keep the conditions, and in time Elijah received the command to anoint Hazael to be king over Syria and Jehu to be king over Israel ^m, which had been severed from Judah when Jeroboam made good the rending ordained by God through the prophet Elijah ⁿ.

Thus the Lord's Anointed is the title which designates kings as reigning by divine right; but it is not limited to the actual lineage of David only

^g 1 Samuel xvi. 6: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου χριστὸς αὐτοῦ.

^h 1 Samuel xvi. 12: ἀγαθὸς ὁράσει Κύριος· καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος πρὸς Σαμουὴλ Ἀνάστα καὶ χρίσον τὸν Δαβὶδ, ὅτι οὗτος ἀγαθὸς ἐστίν.

ⁱ 2 Samuel xi., xii.

^k 2 Samuel xii. 24, 25.

^l 1 Kings viii.

^m 1 Kings xix. 15, 16.

ⁿ 1 Kings xi. 29—39.

—to those who follow in the steps of David—so far as he walked in the ways of God. Unction is the visible sign of their commission, and it is administered by a prophet acting in God's behalf. But the royal power was given conditionally just as in the world outside where, as Ben Sira said °,

Sovereignty is transferred from nation to nation
Because of iniquities and deeds of violence.

And like Saul and David, like Hazael and Jehu, a foreign king like Cyrus might be set apart to perform, however unconsciously, the part assigned him in the divine economy :

Thus says Jahveh (the true God),
to his anointed, to Cyrus,
(The man) whose right hand I have grasped,
to terrify nations
For the sake of Jacob, my Servant,
and Israel my Chosen,
I called thee by thy name ; I delight in thee,
though thou hast not known me.
I am Jahveh, and there is none else,
and beside me there is no God ^p.

In one of the Psalms ^q which traverses the history of Israel from the Covenant with Abraham down to the entrance into Palestine the very Patriarchs

° *Ecclesiasticus* x. 8.

^p Is. xlv. 1, 4, 5 (translation of G. H. Box).

^q *cv.* 12—15.

are spoken of as the Lord's Anointed and as Prophets :

When they were men that could be numbered,
As it were few and sojourners in the land,
He suffered no one to oppress them,
And reprov'd kings for their sake :
Saying, Touch not mine anointed
And to my prophets do no harm.

The words attributed to Jahveh are excluded from the original text as a late gloss by the latest editors^r; but they are justified by the narratives of Genesis. Abraham the greatest of them all—the very father and founder of the Jewish nation—prevailed over kings^s; and the Lord told Abimelech in a dream that he was a prophet^t. Either as king or as prophet he had a formal claim to the title, and the Patriarchs, who were descended from him or shared his importance in the eyes of posterity, received it by a natural poetic licence.

In the eyes of posterity the Patriarchs had an Unction which was of present value for their descendants. St. Paul counted them among the privileges bestowed upon his kinsfolk after the flesh, and among them all second only to the possession of the Messiah, whom he had learned to identify with the risen Jesus, and God Himself^u. "Israel

^r Dr. C. A. and E. G. Briggs.

^s Genesis xiv. : compare Psalm cv. 14.

^t Genesis xx. 7.

^u *Romans* ix. 5. Read ὧν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, to whom belongs

was beloved for the sake of the fathers^x." Like St. Paul, Philo regarded them as living embodiments of God's laws, and respected the doctrine that their overflowing merits availed to redress the shortcomings of later and weaker Jews^y:

The race of the Jews is like an orphan compared with other nations. They are linked together by alliances, but we must hold aloof and devote ourselves to the pursuit of the highest virtue. Yet Moses says that the governor of the universe, to whom this nation has been assigned as his portion, has always compassion and mercy for its orphaned loneliness, because it is set apart as a kind of first fruits^z of mankind for an offering to their Father and Creator. And the reason for this is the famous righteousness and virtues of the founders of the nation, which, like immortal plants, abide in eternal vigour bearing for their descendants saving fruit which avails even to heal all their sins that are not altogether unpardonable^a.

the God who is over all—as it is written, I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

^x *Romans* xi. 28.

^y *De specialibus legibus* iv. (*de instituta*), §§ 179—182 (II. pp. 365, 366 Mangey).

^z Compare James i. 18, and see New Testament Concordance under ἀπαρχή (first-fruits).

^a τὸ δ' αἵτιον αἱ τῶν ἀρχηγῶν τοῦ ἔθνους περιμάχητοι δικαιοσύναι καὶ ἀρεταί, αἱ καθάπερ φωτὰ ἀθάνατα διαμένουσιν ἀειθαλέα καρπὸν φέρουσαι τοῖς ἀπογόνοις σωτήριον καὶ πρὸς πάντα ὠφέλιμον, κἂν αὐτοὶ τύχῳσι διαμαρτάνοντες ἰάσιμα ἀλλὰ μὴ παντελῶς ἀνίατα.

Nevertheless, let no man think that his noble birth from them is all the good he needs, and so come to belittle the necessity of right actions. Let him reckon that a man born of the noblest lineage who brings shame upon his parents by his viciousness merits the greater wrath ; for he who has patterns of excellence at home for his copying and yet fails to stamp their impress on his own life is blameworthy.

After this there is no need to quote further evidence for the belief in the availing merits of the fathers^b which is a peculiar justification of their title —“ Touch not my Christs^c.”

The Messiah as Prophet.

By the laws of Hebrew poetry the parallelism of the couplet

Saying, Touch not mine *Anointed*.

And do my *prophets* no harm

indicates the very close connexion of the Anointed ones and the Prophets, and this connexion or identity is supported by the use of the word in reference to the appointment of the Prophets who are more commonly recognised as such. When Elijah fled from Jezebel despairing of the Israelites in spite of

^b For Rabbinic evidence, see now Schechter, *Some Aspects* xii. (The Zackuth of the Fathers. Imputed righteousness and imputed sin.)

^c Psalm civ. (cv.) 15 (Septuagint) : μή ἀψησθε τῶν χριστῶν μου.

God's vindication of his power on Mount Carmel, he complained that he only was left to keep the covenant and respect the altars of Jehovah. The still small voice came to him and bade him, "Return to the wilderness of Damascus and anoint Elisha to be prophet in thy room^d." The narrative of his obedience says nothing of any formal anointing. Elijah found him ploughing and cast his mantle^e upon him. But before he followed Elijah to minister to him, he sacrificed his oxen and roasted them over his plough, as if he had been admitted to some sort of priestly office. After this he followed Elijah to the end. By witnessing his assumption, he gained the right to inherit his spirit as if he had been his first-born son^f, and the power—(so the Septuagint would have it)—to fulfil the prophecy made to Elijah, Thou shalt leave seven thousand men in Israel that neither kneel to Baal nor worship him^g.

In the Hymn, *Let us now praise famous men*^h, the general effect of these narratives is preserved, and the fame of Elijah is not allowed to dwarf the record of Elisha as was commonly the case. It is true that Elijah anointed Elisha and, therefore, might be reckoned superior to him; but it was done at God's

^d 1 Kings xix.

^e τὸν μῆλωτῆν, the badge of the prophet : compare Hebrews xi. 37.

^f 2 Kings ii. 9 with Deuteronomy xxi. 17.

^g 2 Kings ii. 18 : καὶ καταλείψεις . . . Verse 17 supplies a motive for the transference of the faithful to the period of Elisha's activity after Elijah's death.

^h Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 1.

bidding, and Elijah was merely an agent in the matter. Furthermore Elisha received a double portion of the spirit which rested on Elijah: it was the right of the first-born. The author of the Hymn does not allow his enthusiasm for Elijah to obscure these facts, though of all the famous men only Solomon and Elijah are directly addressed as if they could hear the recitation of their benefactions:

How reverend thou wast Elijah!

And who may glory like thee?

Who didst raise up one deceased from death,

And from hell by the will of the Lord

Who didst anoint kings for vengeance,

And a prophet to follow in thy stead

Who standest ready, as it is written, for the time
appointed

To appease God's anger ere it burst in fury,

To turn the heart of the fathers to the children,

And to establish the tribes of Jacob.

Elijah, who was taken up into heaven to await the time for his coming again according to the prophecy of Malachi, inspires a personal devotion. None the less Elisha gets his due:

When Elijah vanished in the whirlwind,

Elisha was filled with his spirit:

He did twice as many signs as Elijah

And no flesh had dominion over his spirit.

Nothing was impossible for him

In his life he did wonders,

And in his death marvellous works.

A prophet must anoint the king. A prophet—the chief of the prophets—anointed Aaron to be high-priest. And the prophet who stood up like fire, anointed Elisha to be prophet after him. It is clear that the title Christ was essentially connected with the idea of the Prophet who speaks and does nothing from himself, but everything in accordance with the message he transmits from God to men. As one said in the name of Isaiah¹ :

The spirit of the Lord Jahveh is upon me,
Because Jahveh has anointed me ;
To bring glad tidings to the meek he hath sent me,
To bind up the broken-hearted ;
To proclaim liberty to the captives
And release to the bound ;
To proclaim the year of favour of Jahveh,
And the day of vengeance of our God.
To console all who mourn,
To give them a coronal instead of a coronach ;
Oil of joy for a garment of mourning,
A song of praise for a spirit dimmed.

God's prophets declared His will ; and, since that will was always the same, however imperfectly men had apprehended and obeyed it, there was from Moses onwards an accumulation of revelations by which a new prophet could be tested, quite apart from the first question, "Are his own deeds consistent with his words and does his message verify

¹ Isaiah lxi. 1—3 (translation of G. H. Box).

itself when it is put into practice?" It was a rare thing that one prophet should anoint another. The "sons of the prophets" were mostly unworthy to succeed their masters. But the true prophet had always his unction from God whether he was acclaimed like Elisha by another prophet or flamed up suddenly like Elijah. The coming of the revelation was itself his consecration and his commission. As it is written^k:

Prepare to call upon thy God, O Israel. For that He fixeth the thunder and createth the spirit and proclaimeth unto men His Christ; who maketh dawn and evening mists as He goeth upon the high lands of the earth. The Lord God Almighty is His name^l.

King or high-priest, the Lord's Anointed must be a prophet if he is to be sufficient in himself to govern the Lord's own possession, or to speak for them to the Lord. The Scripture speaks of many and various Christs, but the prophetic gift is essential to them all so far as they were really Christs; and the Jews knew it—witness the public proclamation which inaugurated the New Age under Simon the Hasmonaeon.

^k Amos iv. 12, 13 (Septuagint).

^l ἀπαγγέλλων εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ. The Masoretic Hebrew has, "he tells man what is his thought"; but it is obvious that unless all the Lord's people were prophets there was need of one Christ to teach his neighbours.

The Messiah as the future Emissary of God.

Outside the Canon determined by the later Palestinian Rabbis, the title *Christus* occurs in the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon in the picture of the king, the Son of David, who reigns over a holy people in a Jerusalem purified from the pollution of the foreign invader :

And HE a righteous king taught of God shall
be over them ;

And there shall be no unrighteousness in his
days among them,

Because they shall all be holy, and their king
the Lord's Anointed ^m.

Similarly in the eighteenth Psalm ⁿ the day of mercy when God shall chose out His Elect is identified with the raising up of His Anointed and the future generation, which experiences this mercy, is governed by the Lord's Anointed.

This is evidence for the use of the title in the Greek version of documents which seem to belong to the time when the death of Pompey, the first Roman to tame the Jews ^o, was fresh in men's minds,

^m Psalms of Solomon xvii. 35, 36 : καὶ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς δίκαιος καὶ διδακτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν· ὅτι πάντες ἅγιοι, καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν Χριστὸς Κυρίου (the manuscripts have χριστὸς κύριος, *an anointed lord* ; but xviii. 6 seems to justify the cancelling of the natural assimilation of the second word to the first).

ⁿ 6—8.

^o Tacitus, *Histories* v. 9. See especially Psalms of Solomon ii. and the edition of Ryle and James, pp. xl—xliii.

and was taken as God's vengeance for his desecration of the Temple at Jerusalem in B.C. 63.

In a part of the Book of Enoch which shews no sign of the coming of the Romans, and is therefore earlier than the Psalms of Solomon, the same title occurs in visions of the future :

The kings of the earth I will give over into the hand of Mine Elect; as straw in fire they will burn before the face of the holy for they have denied the Lord of Spirits and His Anointed^p.

And again :

The mountains of iron, copper, silver, gold, soft metal, and lead—all these things serve the dominion of His Anointed that he may be potent and mighty on the earth^q.

These passages would seem to reflect the nascent use of the most comprehensive title possible for the expected representative of God, a title chosen because it was devoid of the shame with which liars had defiled the name of prophet.

The Messiah in the New Testament.

In the New Testament the title Messiah is used as a familiar household word which needs no explanation; and the writers of the Epistles work out the

^p Enoch xlviii. 10 (translation of R. H. Charles: compare das Buch Henoch . . . von Flemming und Radermacher. Leipzig, 1901.)

^q Enoch lii. 4.

Old Testament ideas associated with it, as they prove in detail that Jesus was Messiah in spite of all appearance to the contrary.

Of the Four Gospels, only the Fourth pretends—and justifies its pretension—to contain an authentic record of Jesus as He appeared to Jews who really were Jews and not dumb, nondescript lay-figures. The Second Gospel depends upon the reminiscences which St. Peter found suitable for his missionary work among Gentiles whom he could only address through an interpreter. And the growing importance of this work has created in the First and Third Gospels an unbalanced emphasis upon the Galilean Ministry, and also upon what Jesus said without reference to the replies and questions of His interlocutors. The effect has been to cast over these isolated sayings a mist of unreality ; and the neglect of the visits to Jerusalem for the feasts, in which Gentile Christians were (to say the least) not interested, has made the whole disorderly narrative of Mark appear unhistorical and incredible. But in the Fourth Gospel John, the Disciple and not the Apostle of Jesus, gives a simple and coherent narrative of the life of his Master which—less the interpretations put upon it and, perhaps, into it by Gentile readers under the influence (say) of the First Gospel and their own heathen presuppositions—bears upon it the stamp of life and truth—if only it is approached as the record of a Jewish Prophet and taken with all the rest of the literature of Catholick Judaism.

According to the Fourth Gospel—if only it had been put in its proper place at the beginning of the New Testament!—John Baptist replied to the legitimate and natural enquiries of certain priests, that he was neither the Anointed nor the Prophet of whom Moses had spoken but the Voice of which Isaiah had spoken—the incarnation of the fitful Bath Qol or Voice from heaven which was vouchsafed to the Jews in the intervals of the prophetic succession. The Pharisees inferred that, if he were not the Anointed or Elijah or the Prophet, he had no right to do more than deliver his message and prepare the way of Jahveh by vocal preaching: John Baptist replied that in the midst of those who came to accept or criticize his baptism there was his disciple, as yet unknown to him, who was immeasurably greater than himself, and for whose manifestation he practised the rite of baptism, as Gideon had imposed God's tests upon his army. Next day the promised revelation was fulfilled: he saw the sign predicted and hailed Jesus as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.

Many of the Jews were weary of their sins, else they had not come to be baptized. They were disheartened by hopes deferred. The sins of the world in which they had been plunged were patent, and they were no less conscious of their own imperfect submission to the Law.

Even the Passover, with its dim memories of ancient deliverance from the house of bondage,

which had become a veritable city of refuge, and even the Temple feasts were failing in power to convince them of the present help of their own but far-off God. For them, as for the world from which their ancestors had been delivered, there was need of a more comprehensive and complete deliverance from the bondage of sin. John Baptist voiced this craving in his own mind first^r and then admitted two of his disciples to the secret^s. Jesus was for him the Lamb of God just as Elisha was for Elijah his great successor—and Bar Coziba was the Star out of Jacob for Rabbi Aqiba.

John's disciples—Andrew and another—approached Jesus as a Rabbi and returned home with the news, "we have found Messiah." Simon, the brother of Andrew, was brought to Jesus and received the name of Peter. He was to be *Petra*, the rock on which the company of those who accepted Jesus as the Anointed of Jahveh should rest, in spite of his future presumptuous interference at Cæsarea Philippi and his recantation at Jerusalem.

Philip, a native of Bethsaida like Andrew and Peter, was the next adherent, and he told Nathanael in his own way that Jesus the son of Joseph from Nazareth was the Messiah^t—"he of whom Moses wrote in the Law, and the Prophets wrote." Jesus welcomed Nathanael as a true Jew, a son of Israel free from the guile of father Jacob; and Nathanael

^r John i. 29—31.^s John i. 36.^t John i. 45.

accepted Him as Messiah in yet another form of words, "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel." To this confession Jesus replied that he, the true Israelite, should see the dream which Jacob had at Bethel come true, and realise that once more the messengers were passing from man to God and back from God to man.

It was easy for these Jews to accept Jesus as Messiah on the word of a prophet who, refusing that title, had prevailed upon them by his nameless authority to purify themselves, not for an occasional visit to a Temple-sacrifice, but for the remainder of their natural lives. Three of them came from Bethsaida, *Fisher-town*, and fishermen were guileless and credulous folk in those days. Boys and fishermen were the only persons who listened to the Cynic street-preachers in Alexandria—or so Dio Chrysostom said in his dignified, almost episcopal, remonstrance. And Josephus looked down from his Pharisaic-Essene-Sadducean altitude under the distinguished patronage of Vespasian and Titus with an equally profound contempt upon the fisher-folk of Galilee.

But the Pharisees, Levites, and priests and men of weight like Nicodemus were looking for Messiah in those days, all, not only the fishermen, unhampered by preconceptions thanks to the variety of their inherited specifications. It is not difficult to grasp the situation. The Jews cared—or professed to care—for God's help and guidance, as men care for the security

of investment or insurance nowadays, or cared for money *ad hoc* in the world of Petronius and Nero. As men looked for victims to fleece then, and look for philanthropic financiers now on every side, so the Jews looked for the Messiah of Jahveh—and found one after another.

It was a light thing for Nathanael and Philip and Andrew to believe that Jesus was a teacher come from God. The test came when He refused to use His adherents to establish the rule of God by force; and Simon Peter momentarily deserved his fulfilled and allotted function when he said for the Twelve, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and have come to know that Thou art the Holy One of God.

The other Gospels are conditioned in manner and in matter by the exigencies of Christian propaganda beyond the walls of Jewry. Outside the pale the Nazarenes were Christians, and the object of their faith, the object of all the hopes of the Jews, was known as Christ. But it is only when the Synoptic Gospels are first isolated from the Fourth, which explains them, and from the life of the Jews of which it is a part, and then carved to the liking of current Anti-Semitism, that it is possible to assert that when our Lord came there was a definite schedule of the Messiah's qualifications, to suit which cunning Christians manipulated and manufactured what we call the Life of Jesus Christ.

Once more, the use of the title Messiah or Christ:

in reference to the expected emissary of God is not earlier than the first century B.C., and its use is evidence of some attempt to piece together the promises of God, expressed or implied in Scripture, relative to the different deliverers who had been sent to meet various needs at widely-distant times.

The Messiah in Josephus.

Now the impression conveyed by the Synoptic Gospels is that Christ was the only title of the Messiah, and was possessed of a known rigid content, and was appropriated to the Christians so completely that the Christian idea of the person of Jesus Christ must always be read into it. This impression is as independent of the antecedent and the subsequent history of the word as Marcion himself could wish. But Marcion is a heretic; and the Bible of the Christian Church still consists of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, the other Books, and the Books of the New Testament—in that order. And having this Bible, which contains not only the Apocrypha but also the Fourth Gospel, it is possible for us to appreciate and accept as genuine the description of our Lord which is contained in the *Antiquities*^u of Josephus :

At this time—during Pilate's term of office as governor of Judæa—there was one Jesus, a wise man, if it is right to call him a man seeing

^u xviii. 3. 3. (§§ 63, 64 Niese).

that he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of men who received the truth with pleasure and attracted many Jews as well as many who belonged to the Greek world. He was the Christ. And, though Pilate condemned him to the cross on the information of our leading men, those who loved him at the first did not cease to love him ; for he appeared to them alive again on the third day—after his crucifixion, inasmuch as the prophets had said this and a thousand other things concerning him. And to this day the tribe of the Christians, who had their name from him, has not failed.

In another place* Josephus has this notice of the death of James in 62 A.D. :

Festus died before his successor was appointed, and in the interval which elapsed before the arrival of Albinus Ananus the younger, who was made high-priest by the King, found his opportunity for taking action against the Christians. He was a man of bold and daring character, and one of the Sadducean persuasion—and the Sadducees are cruel in the matter of punishments beyond all other Jews. Being what he was, Ananus set up a panel of judges, and brought before them James the brother of Jesus called Christ and some others. He accused them of breaking the Law and delivered them up to be stoned.

* *Antiquities* xx. 9. 1 (§§ 197—203 Niese).

The Pharisees, who are known to be the gentlest, mildest of men, and strict in their observance of the Law^y, were indignant at this and sent secretly to the king beseeching him to direct Ananus to stop proceedings on the ground that his first action—the summoning of the judges^z—had put him in the wrong. Some of them also laid information before Albinus, who was on his way from Alexandria, and persuaded him to threaten Ananus with reprisals. And so King Agrippa deprived Ananus of the high-priesthood after three months' tenure.

The second of these passages is accepted as genuine Josephus, and it goes far to explain and guarantee the first. The Christians were not so superficially prominent and important in the period of their history which is covered by Josephus as later Christians, who studied it only in Christian writings, have imagined. Nor were the Pharisees, always and all of them, such determined enemies of the sect as Saul of Tarsus. It is obvious that Josephus disapproved of the persecution of the Christians by the Sadducean high-priest just as

^y ὅσοι δὲ ἐδόκουν ἐπιεικέστατοι τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἶναι καὶ περὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς.

^z . . . παρακαλοῦντες ἐπιστεῖλαι τῷ Ἀνάγῃ μηκέτι τοιαῦτα πράσσειν· μηδὲ γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ὀρθῶς αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι. τινὲς δ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν Ἀλβῖνον . . . διδάσκουσιν ὥς οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν Ἀνάγῃ χωρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης καθίσαι συνέδριον.

much as his fellow-Pharisees—the adjectives *mild* and *strict* are a sufficient label—who were at pains to invoke competent authority to put an end to it. It must have been gall and bitterness to them to recall and advertise their humiliation, that the high-priest could not summon the Council without the leave of the Roman governor, but they did it. They were Pharisees like Gamaliel: they were waiting to see whether the teaching of Jesus and His apostles was of God or not.

The earlier description of Jesus Himself is commonly held to be spurious, and it must be admitted that for Christian ears phrases like *if he were really a man* and *he was the Christ* have a Christian ring about them. But it is quite clear that Josephus could not but approve of the Christian policy of non-resistance to Rome. The Christians were not Zealots, and they were not the dupes of a notoriously false prophet who had promised them some sudden stroke of Divine interference in their favour. It is true that some of them broke the Law and offered to the world what seemed to him a mutilated, mangled Judaism; but earlier Jewish missionaries also had made concessions to their converts, and from the passage about James it appears that Josephus was ready to tolerate them.

If that passage is condemned likewise, and Josephus is credited with a proper horror of the Christians and their dead founder, the description of their dead founder assumes another

aspect, but it is not therefore to be rejected as a forgery. The statement *he was the Christ* is historical and not in any case a personal confession of faith. Jesus was the Christ, the Messiah of the Christians, who could not save Himself from the cross. He was the Christ—*Chrestus* the kindly simpleton or the Anointed who was not the Anointed of Jahveh. Of all the Jewish Messiahs—to use the modern term—he was known as the Christ even to pagan historians like Tacitus. And the phrase *if he was a man at all* is equally suitable to this reading of Josephus' attitude, for it is capable of suggesting that Josephus knew of Docetic views among Christians which were to his mind a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole Gospel.

But whatever view this latitudinarian Jew really took of the Christians, his reference to Jesus is no more than the statement of the current Christian belief from the standpoint of an external examiner, who had better opportunities for appraising the nature and antecedents of primitive Christianity than Tacitus or modern investigators. :

CHAPTER III.

THE MODERN VIEW OF THE JEWISH HOPE.

OF those who still trouble themselves to look back upon the past history of mankind, and of those Christians who care to consider the pit from which they were digged, many desiderate only a resonant generalisation and a clear-cut formula or two to serve them as a clue to the labyrinth over which they cast their hurried gaze. They jeer at those who "cannot see the wood for the trees," that is those who cannot see the wood as they see it, and they talk about "a bird's-eye view" as the one thing needful and a thing attainable by a man. Here, then, is the wood of Catholick Judaism, from which Jesus of Nazareth, Philo of Alexandria, Saul of Tarsus, and the Doctors of the Talmud emerged severally to mould the course of men's religious life. Their followers have surveyed them severally and have summarised either Christianity or Judaism into a nutshell—truth enough in the most highly concentrated form to nourish Jew or Christian for his life. But they chose the tree out of all the wood from which they took that nut—beech-nut, cob-nut, or what not. It is they who cannot see the wood for the tree. And as for the "bird's-eye view," it is not much use to the aviator to discern a blurred

sea-scape or a vague moorland where a lark could descry its home or a falcon its quarry.

To take a bird's-eye view of modern opinion about this particular wood, it is proclaimed by Christian or at any rate non-Jewish scholars, that there are two trees which matter; the Jews hoped for the Son of David and the Christians for the Son of Man.

Since the Jews came first the prevalent modern conception of their Hope has a prior claim upon our consideration.

The Modern view of the Son of David.

Dr. Hollmann of Halle published in 1905 a popular book which was translated into English and published in 1909 under the title, *The Jewish Religion in the Time of Jesus*. Writing with all the authority and sense of responsibility which pertain to those who address a public careless and ignorant of such matters, he speaks thus^a of the Jewish conception of the Messiah:

However clearly we must recognize that Jewish piety ascribes to the Messiah a high level, indeed a unique level of religious and moral worth, which is described sometimes in glorious words, yet in the mind of the Jew, when he thinks of the future son of David, what stands first is something else—the overthrow of enemies, the glorious kingly rule in Palestine. . . .

^a pp. 87, 88.

In support and explanation of this view Dr. Hollmann appeals to the "picture of the glorious future contained in the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon":

How characteristic these verses are! Yes, it was of this that every pious Jew of that time thought first, when he spoke of the Messiah—the shattering of enemies with a staff of iron, destruction of the Roman empire, which had now laid its heavy hand on the Holy Land as once, in Daniel's time, the Grecian empire had done. Jewish piety is filled with that thirst for revenge to which this^b is a religious desire—"In thy loving kindness cut off mine enemies, and destroy all that oppress me, for I am thy servant," which could apostrophise Babylon^c, "Happy shall he be that seizes and dashes thy little ones against the rock."

His conclusion of the whole matter is this^d:

Paul was well warranted in testifying of his own nation that they had a zeal for God^e. And yet a misguided zeal, which found no true satisfaction . . . We see a heaving and tossing out of which now this mood emerges, now that. But one thing we miss, the unshakable rock in the raging sea, the unity in multiplicity, the sure peace amid the tumult. He who surveys the whole must say, after all, Judaism lacked that stability

^b Psalm cxliii. 12.

^d pp. 128—131.

^c Psalm cxxxvii. 9.

^e Romans x. 2.

of confidence which is certain of the issue. . . . The Jewish thought of God was intrinsically mean, for he was conceived in the image of a strict taskmaster.

And he has phrases like these :

The Jew had a high opinion, when all was said, of his own person and the worth of his own performance . . . all those that beneath the crushing load of the single legal ordinances could neither attain to true earthly energy nor to true communion with God . . . religious frittering and futility . . . the whole confusing multiplicity of individual works.

If these things be true of every pious Jew, then it is clear the race must have died out at the sack of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.; and we are able to trace exactly the inevitable causes through which one species of the mammal *Homo Sapiens* became finally extinct. But, though for most of us the history of the Jews stops short at this point, there are records^f of certain people resident in England and known as the King's Jews. When King Richard set out on the great crusade—his Coronation day had been marked by a massacre of Jews, which the Chronicler described as “an unexampled Providence

^f As this is quite outside my period I follow J. H. Bridges (*Oxford Essays*, 1857), whose “narrative is taken from William of Newburgh, a contemporary, and who, if not an eye-witness, seems to have taken great pains to arrive at accurate detail” (p. 223, note).

and so strengthening to the Christian confidence"—he legislated for their safety during his absence. But once he was away, the Jews of York, who had kept the state of kings under the protection of Henry II., were compelled to seek safety from the mob in the castle, and there were closely besieged. On the night before the final assault an old rabbi who had come from beyond seas to spread the knowledge of the law among his brethren in England, who received him as a prophet, spoke thus :

God to whom none may say, Why dost thou so ? has now laid it before us to die for his law. Death, as ye see, stands at the door ; unless ye rather choose for this short life to desert God's law and live on the alms of the wicked in the deep shame of apostasy. Let us, then, like men choose death ; and death not at the hands of a laughing enemy, but in its most honourable and painless shape—a free surrender of life to Him that gave it. Let those stand apart who will not follow my counsel.

In the morning the castle was in flames, and those who had stood aside let fall the dead bodies of those who had found sure peace amid the tumult.

These wicked men (they said) have ended their wicked lives in self-slaughter ; to us affliction has taught wisdom ; we long for baptism, and for the faith and peace of Christ.

The Son of David the Hope of the Zealots.

The fact is, of course, that Dr. Hollmann and those from whom he takes his view are simply confusing the Hope of Catholick Judaism with the ideas of the Zealots who rebelled against Rome under Nero and Vespasian. And the language in the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon, which he names and does not quote, produced as a matter of history no such effect as his interpretation of it requires. Here is the passage § :

See, Lord, and raise up for them their king, the
Son of David,
For the time that thou knowest, O God,
To reign over Israel thy servant ;
And gird him with might to shatter unrighteous
rulers,
(Cleanse Jerusalem from heathen that trample and
destroy)
By wisdom and righteousness to expel sinners
from thine heritage,
And to break the pride of the sinner like a potter's
vessels,

§ Psalms of Solomon xvii. 23—27. The text seems to have been worked over and enriched like the text of Ecclesiasticus used by Clement of Alexandria (for example): phrases like "Son of David," "and destroy," being added to fill out what is apparently the normal line. Ryle and James take the Infinitives "to expel," &c., as Optatives and as having "really the force of the Future." The Infinitive which preserves the proper ambiguity of the subject—what the king is to do is what God is to do through him—seems preferable.

With an iron rod to crush all their confidence,
To blot out lawless nations by the word of his
mouth,

That at his threat nations may flee before his face,
And to convict sinners by the word of their heart.

For the strict Jew of the period Pompey was guilty of sacrilege when he entered the Holy of Holiesⁿ; and his guilt was proved by the verdict of God, the death-penalty which actually overtook him some fifteen years later. After the battle of Pharsalia in 48 B.C., he took his wife and son, and sought an asylum in Egypt from the boy-king, whose father he had befriended. As the ship came to anchor, a small boat put out from the shore where the king himself was standing. As it neared the ship, Septimius, a centurion who had served under Pompey, stood up and acclaimed him in Latin as Imperator, while Achilles, an Egyptian Privy Councillor, welcomed him in Greek and prayed him to enter the boat. The beach was lined with hoplites and troop-ships were sighted. There was no hope of escape. Pompey kissed his wife, who was already bewailing his end, and embarked. As Achilles and his men gave him their hands, he turned to his wife and son with the words of Sophocles on his lips:

But whoso come within a despot's power,
Free though he come and freely, is his slave.

ⁿ Josephus, *Antiquities* xiv. 4. 4 (§§ 71—73 Niese).

The boat drew near to land and his wife and friends watched anxiously what should happen. A guard of honour fell in to receive him as he landed. But when he took his freedman's hand to help him rise, Septimius stabbed him—his old commander—from behind. The others drew their swords. Without one unworthy word or deed Pompey drew his toga over his face with both hands, and with one groan endured their blows.

He had not plundered the Templeⁱ, but he had profaned it (perhaps in ignorance); and the sins of Gabinius^j, his successor, were transferred to his account by the Psalmist who regarded him as the embodiment of the Dragon's pride^k:

And God delayed not to shew me his dishonour :
The insolent one lying pierced upon the shore of
Egypt,
Despitefully entreated on land and sea, less than
the lowest,
His body rotting on the waves in great contempt ;
And there was none to bury him.

Pompey's clemency was forgotten by this time, and Julius Cæsar, against whom he had dared to match himself, was the friend of the Jews, who were soon to weep beside his bier^l. But, when Pompey

ⁱ Cicero, *pro Flacco* 67 : Tacitus, *Histories* v. 9 : Josephus, *Antiquities* xiv. 4. 4 (§§ 71—73 Niese). Pompey ordered the cleansing of the Temple the day after his visit.

^j Cicero, *pro Sestio* 43.

^k Psalms of Solomon ii. 29—31.

^l Suetonius, *Julius Cæsar* 84 : compare the estimates of Cæsar given by Philo and Josephus.

entered Palestine, he had received a deputation which throws another light upon the hopes of the Jewish people at the time. The people, who were loyal disciples of the Pharisees, sent a deputation to plead for the abolition of the monarchy on the ground that it was their traditional right to obey the priests of the God whom they worshipped; whereas the rivals Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, though they were descendants of these priests, had attempted to bring the nation under a different form of government in order to make them slaves^m. This echo of Samuel's address to Israel, when they clamoured for a king, is couched in language calculated to appeal to the Roman mind, which held the *mos maiorum* in reverence, and had a regard for the *Pontifex Maximus*. But this does not affect its historicity: the scribes who went in and out among them were dependent for their knowledge of God's Will upon the Scriptures or the oral tradition, and the priests were more likely (in theory, at any rate) to be, like Samuel, in touch with God Himself.

The meaning of the title Son of David.

Now in regard to the conception of the Jewish Hope which Dr. Hollmann and others derive from

^m Josephus, *Antiquities* xiv. 3. 2 (§ 41 Niese): καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων διήκουσεν καὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οἱ πρὸς τε ἀλλήλους διεφέροντο Ὑρκανὸς καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος καὶ τὸ ἔθνος πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους, τὸ μὲν οὐκ ἀξιοῦν βασιλεύεσθαι· πάτριον γὰρ εἶναι τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῦ τιμωμένου παρ' αὐτοῖς θεοῦ πειθαρχεῖν, ὄντας δὲ τούτους ἀπογόνους τῶν ἱερέων εἰς ἄλλην μετὰγειν ἀρχὴν τὸ ἔθνος ζητῆσαι, ὥπως καὶ δοῦλον γένοιτο.

such passages as these, history shews that "every pious Jew" did *not* dream of an orgy of blood and fire. Under pressure of persecution and sacrilege they might exult that God avenged Himself upon Pompey, when he came to be regarded as a sacrilegious persecutor; but the instrument of his vengeance was a Gentile and not a Jew at all—one of those who could not accept the Ten Commandments because killing (and so on) was their trade. If assassination was, as events proved from time to time, necessary for the furtherance of God's reign on earth, or even warfare, it was clearly far better that it should be committed to those who had not accepted the yoke of the commandment, Thou shalt do no murder. The Son of David of whom the Psalmist dreams, does not appeal to the arm of flesh. He has not even sling and stones from the brook, with which to combat the latest representative of Goliath.

He shall destroy the ungodly nations *with the words of his mouth,*

He shall convict the sinners *in the thought of their heart*ⁿ.

This is no ordinary conquering king, but a prophet whose message exercises an irresistible influence upon the consciences of his opponents. He deals with the oppressors of Israel as Nathan dealt with David in the matter of Uriah's wife, and his title

ⁿ See (for example) the rest of the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon.

identifies him as the anti-type of Solomon, who was born to prove that David's penitence had won forgiveness of his crimes.

Solomon, the son of David, was the pledge of God's restored favour; and he was born to do what David as a man of war might not do, to build the House of God. By succeeding to David's throne he became *the* Son of David; and, wherever the future Messiah was called by that name, the figure of Solomon purified from his sins, like his father, filled the minds of men with the vision of a Prince of Peace, endowed with wisdom from on high, such as Ben Sira sang in the Hymn of the Fathers^o:

And for his sake there arose after him

A wise son who dwelt in confidence:

Solomon reigned in days of solace^p—

And God made peace for him roundabout—

Who builded a house for God's name,

And made ready for ever a sanctuary.

How wise wast thou in thy youth!

Like a full Nile was thine understanding! . . .

Thy songs and proverbs and parables

And thy jests^q stirred the nations like a whirlwind.

^o Ecclesiasticus xlvii. 12—18 (ignoring the historical survey of his decline which led to the disruption of the kingdom).

^p The Hebrew word is *Shloh* (peace), an echo of his name.

^q *Melliçah* has the force of *taunt* or *sarcasm* in Habakkuk ii. 6: in Proverbs i. 6 Aquila has the more decorous *interpretation* like the Greek translator here.

Thou wast called by the glorious name
Which is called over Israel ^r.

Of course the Zealots might take up arms, in order to prepare the way for the Son of David, when they judged that the fit time for human action had come. But as a matter of fact they refrained for more than a century. Pompey, Julius Cæsar, and Augustus, each in his turn restored peace to the warring world; and the Jews only needed to wait for the Lord's Anointed, the chief and perfect Prophet.

The delimitation of the title, Son of David, illegitimate in view of the ideas embodied in Solomon, may perhaps be ascribed to the Zealots, whom Josephus distinguishes sharply from the Pharisees whose tenets they shared. Certainly, so far as they had any ideal at all, the Zealots and Assassins and Galileans, portrayed by Josephus in his *Jewish War*, cherished the hope of achieving political and national independence by whatever means they could find. And they had predecessors in the troubles which preceded and followed the full ascendancy of Herod the Great. The Brigands of Josephus are the violent men of the Gospels, the men who made a breach—Pharisees to be taunted with an echo of *Phares*, Sicarii, *dagger-men* for Greeks and Romans but *hirelings* in Jewish speech ^s. But this revival of hopes condemned again and

^r i.e. Jedidiah.

^s See John x. 8—15.

again by the traditional Jewish history was never formulated or adopted by Catholick Judaism. It belongs to the Rabbinic period of Judaism, and is even later than the defeat of Bar-Cochebas, whom Rabbi Aqiba proclaimed to his incredulous colleagues as a Messiah of this political or national sort. Till that time it was misleading to speak of a nation in the ordinary sense of the word, unless it be remembered that it was open to anyone to become a Jew who would profess the Jewish faith, and that the "stranger within the gates" was held in more honour by Aqiba (for example) than many born Jews. As for political independence, the people asked, as they asked Pompey and those who came after him, only for shelter under the shadow of Rome and freedom of conscience. But Aqiba—and such a man could only have been roused to do what he did by some attempt to exterminate the religion, like that of Antiochus Epiphanes—judged that the time was come for an appeal to arms, and found his Messiah in Bar-Cochebas. Scanty as the notices are, it is clear that most of the Rabbis held aloof. One said, "Grass shall grow out of thy mouth Aqiba before Messiah come"; and another went the length of saying, "There is now no Messiah for Israel: they have eaten him in the days of Hezekiah." Now Hezekiah was a Chief-Robber, as Josephus says^t,

^t *Antiquities* xiv. 9. 2 (§§ 159, 160 Niese). Herod killed him, much to the delight of the Syrians.

and his fate with the fate of the sons who followed in his footsteps was enough to persuade men, if they needed persuasion, that Messiahs of that type could not be Messiahs of Jahveh, while as yet Rome held her empire.

The belief in a Messianic Son of David of this narrow and perverted kind was formulated in opposition to the Christian Conception of Messiah at a time when it was notorious that revolutionary heroes were banned. Phrases which occur in Dr. Schechter's summary (for example) bear upon them the impress of the Jews' hatred of Rome, and yet they were safe to use because the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, which was due to the Zealots, had excluded any literal fulfilment of them from the minds of true Jews—always supposing that they were not forced to abandon the sacraments of their religion without being allowed to die.

It is in the *Dialogue with Trypho* of Justin Martyr and in Origen's *Reply to Celsus*, that this "political and earthly" conception is best exhibited, and there its deliberately anti-Christian character is indicated unmistakably.

The Anti-Christian Conception in Celsus.

Celsus put it in his book that many other men had appeared who were just as good as Jesus—for those who were ready to be deceived by them^u.

^u Origen, *Against Celsus* ii. 8: φησὶ δὲ πολλοὺς ἄν καὶ ἄλλους φανῆναι τοιούτους τοῖς ἐξαπατᾶσθαι θέλουσιν ὁποῖος ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

And though Origen calls indignantly upon the long-dead Jew who prompted this attack to justify it by producing even one, it was a true saying. There were magicians in those days who could create a sumptuous banquet out of nothing, as men came to think that Jesus did. There were stories of others who had been raised from the dead after more than even a *full* three days' burial. Among the Jews there had been violent men who struck less wildly for their chosen leaders than St. Peter did at Gethsemane; and there had been prophets who led their dupes into the wilderness to find Jordan cloven asunder for their crossing or to the Mount of Olives to see the walls of Jerusalem fall down flat to give them access.

The rise of Christianity is equally impossible to explain, if the Christians depended merely on the fulfilment of prophecy. According to the Jews—Celsus retorted in advance—the prophets declare that he who shall visit us is great, an emperor, lord of all the earth and all the nations and armies^v. There was no longer any need for Origen to answer this, because the Christians had already met it by the theory of two Visitations or Advents of Christ—one in the past of suffering and humiliation, and one in the future of glory and honour. And, provided that

^v Origen, *Against Celsus* ii. 29: οὐκέτι χρεία ἡμᾶς ἀπολογήσασθαι πρὸς τὸ λεγόμενον ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, ὅτι μέγαν καὶ δυνάστην καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ στρατοπέδων κύριόν φασιν οἱ προφῆται εἶναι τὸν ἐπιδημήσοντα.

individual Christians could shew by their life and doctrine that each of them in their several microcosms and all together in the larger microcosm of the Christian Church experienced already the benefits of this future coming, the answer sufficed. But the scoffing outsider insisted on superficial and material proof of this majestic supremacy—"there are ten thousand others to whom you could adjust these prophecies more plausibly than to Jesus."

No formal creed, and, still more, no such attenuated conceptions of the person of the Christ as modern critics assign to Catholick Judaism or to primitive Christianity, can explain the success of Jewish and Christian missions or the persistence of both Christianity and Judaism. They were ready to make a defence when they were called upon, as St. Peter commanded the Christians, but the real argument which moved men was the Jewish or Christian life, in which the fruits of their experience of God were manifest. *There* was the real *Apologia* for the mother-church and for the daughter-sect: St. Paul's converts are his best Epistle general. But so soon as Jew fell out with Christian the formal apologetic of either religion was undermined. Celsus could see it; and, to all appearance, it was not till Clement of Alexandria and Origen assimilated Philo so far as they could and so joined hands with Judaism again, that Christianity produced anything comparable to Philo's monumental portrait of a religion in being.

In the *de Principiis*^w, again, Origen gives the Jewish interpretation of Jacob's prophecy: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah . . . until Shiloh come":

They assert that the ethnarch, being of the race of Judah, ruled the people, and thus the rulers of his seed will not fail until the coming of Christ which they imagine^x.

A similar tradition is reported (without the name of its authority) in the Babylonian Talmud, which specifies the chief of the Babylonian exiles and the patriarchs of Jerusalem as the existing princes of Judah: Origen presumably thought of the Jewish ethnarch in Alexandria. But for the Christian Jacob's prophecy meant that the line of princes of Judah and rulers sprung from his loins should then cease when HE came for whom the sovereignty is reserved and the expectation of the nations visited them^y. They followed the Septuagint and interpreted the passage Messianically just as the Jews

^w iv. 3.

^x τοὺς, ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ Γενέσει ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰακώβ πρὸς τὸν Ἰούδαν εἰρημένων, φάσκοντας τὸν ἐθνάρχην, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰούδα γένους τυγχάνοντα, ἄρχειν τοῦ λαοῦ, οὐκ ἐκλείψοντων τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἧς φαντάζονται Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίας.

^y *Genesis* xlix. 10: οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα, καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μνηρῶν αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀπόκειμενα αὐτῷ (Origen and the Christian fathers generally read ᾧ ἀπόκειται), καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν. The third clause still divides interpreters: Dr. Skinner, the latest of them, renders, "Until . . . come . . . (?)." Ben Sira seems to have read "until *Sheleh* (tranquillity) come," and to have found a fulfilment in Solomon. (See *Ecclesiasticus* xlix. quoted above.)

did, with a slight difference of emphasis. But they detected the failure of the succession; and, therein, another demonstration of their thesis that Jesus was the Christ. Origen says:

It is abundantly clear from history and from what we see about us to-day that there are no longer men bearing the title Kings of the Jews: all the furniture of Judaism, the temple with its altar and its services and the vestments of the high-priest, everything on which they prided themselves, has been destroyed. For the prophecy² was fulfilled which said, Many days shall the children of Israel sit with no king nor even a ruler, with no sacrifice and not even an altar or priesthood or oracle.

That the destruction of the high-priest's vestments forms the climax is a true reminiscence of the far-off time when their custody was a proof of supremacy for which the Romans contended with the Jews, and which was of sufficient importance to be referred to the Emperors Tiberius and Claudius for their decision³. And this piece of historical reminiscence points to the antiquity of this controversy, to which the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus owes its importance. When Antiochus Epiphanes made his

² Hosea iii. 4: *ἡμέρας πολλὰς καθήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ὄντος βασιλείως οὐδὲ ὄντος ἀρχοντος οὐδὲ* (Origen οὐκ) *οὔσης θυσίας οὐδὲ ὄντος θυσιαστηρίου οὐδὲ ἱερατείας οὐδὲ δήλων.*

³ See (for example) Josephus, *Antiquities* xv. 11. 4 (§§ 403—409 Niese).

far deadlier attack on Judaism, there were no Christians to improve the occasion.

The Jewish Messiah in Justin Martyr.

In his *dialogue with Trypho* Justin has handed down to posterity, thanks to his literary skill or his fame as a Martyr, a specimen of the controversies in which Jews and Christians provoked each other to examine and exploit all the prophecies of the Old Testament, irrespective of previous interpreters. For the most part the controversialists did not aspire to produce literature. Broad-sheets and manuals of relevant texts—as they reckoned relevance—were produced and multiplied by their subterranean activities, till at last they sprang up and blossomed in this Dialogue, just as the catechetical manuals culminated in the *Pædagogus* of Clement of Alexandria. In both cases the texts utilised were affected by their new environment, and the interpretations put upon them, in continuation of the process to which the Sayings of Jesus Himself were subjected from the beginning. In both cases it is possible to put beside the literary product specimens of late or uncertain origin, which are, nevertheless, legitimate descendants of the unknown predecessors of Clement and Justin.

To illustrate these reported debates there is a saying, attached to the name of Dr. Johnson, to

the effect that, when he composed the Parliamentary reports from the meagre details available, he took care not to let the Whig dogs have the best of it. But as he boasted that he understood Whiggism—"a negation of all principle"—he presumably gave them speeches proper to their character. The same is generally true of Christian reports of controversies with the Jews. One can learn something of Judaism from them as well as much of Christianity. Here, then, in brief is Justin's report of Trypho's defence and presentation of the Jewish Gospel, so far as it relates to the Messiah :

The first thing is to hope in God and not in man. Next be circumcised and keep the Sabbath, the feasts, and the new moons of God, as His Law commands ; in a word, do all that is written in the Law, and then perhaps God will have mercy upon you. But as for Christ, if he actually has come into being and is—somewhere, he is unknown and does not even understand himself, nor has he any power at all until Elias come and anoint him and make him manifest to all ^b.

Scriptures like these—Justin had just quoted the seventh chapter of Daniel—compel us to expect and await one great and glorious, who like a Son of Man receives from the Ancient of Days the eternal sovereignty. But your Christ,

^b *Dialogue* 8.

as you call him, was so completely devoid of honour and glory that he incurred the utmost curse recorded in the God's Law ; for he was crucified^c.

We all expect the Christ to be born a man from human parents, and we expect Elias to come and anoint him. If then your Christ is the Christ for whom we look, he must certainly be regarded as a man born of human parents—and some of you so believe ; but from the fact that Elias has not come I infer that he is not the Christ^d.

Scripture does not say : "Behold the *virgin* shall conceive and bear a son," but, "Behold the *girl*," and so on as you said. But the whole prophecy relates to Hezekiah, as the events of his life are enough to prove. On the other hand in the mythology of the Greeks it is said that Perseus was born of Danae, being a virgin, because what they call Zeus flowed over her in the form of gold. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves for saying precisely what they say. You ought rather to admit that this Jesus was a man, and if you try to prove from the Scriptures that he is the Christ, prove that he was deemed worthy to be chosen for Messiah because he lived a law-abiding and a perfect life. Don't venture into fairy tales or you'll be convicted of a foolishness equal to the folly of the Greeks^e.

^c *Dialogue 32.*

^d *Dialogue 49.*

^e *Dialogue 67.*

It is incredible and almost impossible, this thing you are trying to demonstrate, that God endured to be born and to become a man^f.

You know quite well that all our race expects the Messiah, and we acknowledge that all the Scriptures which you have quoted were spoken in reference to him ; and I admit that the name Jesus, borne by Joshua the son of Nun, has almost disposed me to surrender. But we still find no evidence of any Scriptural authority for his dishonourable crucifixion ; he that is crucified—it is said in the Law—is accursed. On this point at any rate I am unconvinced. It is obvious that the Scriptures proclaim the Christ to be capable of suffering ; but the point we would learn from you is that it should take this particular form of suffering, which is expressly declared accursed in the Law^g.

Some of the arguments which Justin permits his Trypho to use represent a certain hardening and narrowing down in the Jewish position, consequent upon the Christian controversy. Take (for example) the Immanuel prophecy. The "Septuagint" translator took *Almah* to mean Virgin ; or, at any rate, he left it open to his readers to understand that something different from an ordinary birth was intended—if they so pleased. From the parallel which Trypho draws to the Christian theory it is quite clear that the Christians of his imagina-

^f *Dialogue* 68.

^g *Dialogue* 89.

tion, like the Greeks who accepted the story of Perseus, asserted that neither the conception nor the birth of the child affected the virginity of his mother. But on the whole it seems probable that the Christians read into the passage what they found there and employed the prophecy to justify out of Scripture what they already believed on other grounds. The birth of the child is not necessarily part of the sign if the sign is to be taken as something supernatural, any more than all the details of a parable—or an Homeric simile—fit the thing indicated by the analogy. Probably the translator would have quarrelled with his translators. He puts the future tense in place of the present, and so leaves the ordinary Greek reader to supply the natural fact that the virgin in question became someone's wife in the interval, like Rebekah. And moreover he might well have urged that according to Jewish teaching, "Children were an heritage from the Lord."

For the rest it must suffice for the present to say that the points taken by Trypho have *some* bearing upon the selection—some critics would say, invention—of the particular sayings and incidents of our Lord's life, which are recorded in the Gospels. The immediate importance of the outline is that it shews the effect of controversy with the Christians upon Jewish doctrine in the way of greater definiteness and narrowness, and, to some quite indefinable extent, of Scriptural exploration.

Furthermore, this controversy tended to obscure certain aspects which were firmly believed by both parties.

The Suffering Messiah.

The thing is not that the Jews had not conceived the possibility of such a suffering Messiah as Isaiah delineated, but that the Christians came forward with a suffering Messiah, and many of the Jews being unbelievers, as the Christians said, or believers, as they said of themselves, emphasized the contrary features in the fragmentary portrait, which they began to piece together when first they spoke of Christ, and on which they busied themselves with greater eagerness when the Christians propounded the creed, Jesus is the Christ^h. The Jews who cherished the memory of the Maccabean Martyrs knew for themselves that God had sent—and would likely send again—men of no reputation but that they gained by their death, women who would not exclude their new-born sons from the covenant with Almighty God, though He slew them and their babies by the hand of the soldiers of Antiochus. *Sanguis martyrorum semen*. Ignoble and unknown these victims testified in the extremity which had overtaken the Nation to the Hope that was in them. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." Their life of simple faith was no proof that God had

^h It was a new thing that a single person should be regarded as fulfilling all the promises.

anointed them to do Him special service, but their suffering and their death affirmed their place in the series of His worthiest servants. All this was known; Catholick Judaism had its blessed Martyrs and Confessors, and their blood was not shed in vain. The Hasmonaeans had stood at bay, dared to break the Sabbath to keep the rest of the Law, and, joined by the Hasidaean Scribes, they prevailed till the Temple was cleansed and dedicated afresh. The Christians had their Martyr who was crucified and therefore accursed. Brigands and Pharisees had been crucified before, and their followers who believed in them had mourned for them. But this Jesus was condemned not only by the Sanhedrin but also by the people. Even His followers acquiesced in the accomplished fact—"we had hoped that this was the deliverer of Israel." It was common ground for believers and unbelievers (apportion the names as you will) that the Christ who summed up in Himself all the functions of the Lord's Anointed must suffer. The Jews took this for granted, and asked for evidence that Jesus being, as the Christians said, the final and the perfect Messiah, had achieved the triumph of which the prophets had foreseen. That is why the Messiah of Rabbinic Judaism was in the first instance robbed to all appearance of the qualifications of the Suffering Servant of Jahveh.

That the Jews tended to dwell upon the triumph of their Christ is plain on the face of it. It was only

natural. They themselves were God's elect people, entitled collectively to the name of Christ, since they were set in the world to proclaim the truth about God. Incidentally and individually many of them suffered in the performance of their function. It was natural that they should console and comfort themselves with the thought of the glory of God, which should issue and did issue from their present sufferings. The Feast of Dedication was a yearly memorial of the glory that had come out of such suffering, and the saving the Temple from the pollution of Caligula's colossal image was something for Philo to set against the persecution of the Jews of Alexandria.

But though they tended to hearten themselves with phrases which only desperadoes could and did put into practice when might was right, their ideal was never so impoverished as men say nowadays. The word of God was precious when there was no open vision, and they dreamed of glories, for the Glory of the Lord was round about them still. Their passion was present, but they put it from them when they looked ahead. From the time of the Exile to the time of Hadrian, to go no further either way, some Jews were somewhere suffering for their faith, and the Nation had conserved the primitive consciousness of solidarity. We must not grudge them their vision of triumph—God's triumph and not their own—nor misconstrue the silence with which they endured the suffering that had

to be borne in silence, if possible, but, by someone, somehow. And so to get back to ancient facts before approaching other modern theories, it will be as well to read some more of the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon, from which Dr. Hollmann ostensibly and distressfully derived his unpleasant and painful notions.

The Son of David at full length.

O Lord thou art our king for this age and beyond
it,

For in thee, our God, our soul shall exult.

And what is the time of a man's life upon the
earth?

Yet for his time *his* hope is set upon it.

But *we* will hope upon God our Saviour

For the might of our God is for the age with
mercy ;

And the reign of our God is for the age over
the nations.

Thou, Lord, didst choose David to be king over
Israel ;

And thou didst swear to him concerning his
seed for ever,

That his dynasty should not fail before
thee

See, Lord, and raise up for them their king, the
Son of David,

For the time that thou knowest, O God,
To reign over Israel thy child ;

And gird him with might to shatter the unrighteous
rulers . . .

And he shall cleanse Jerusalem with sanctification,
as it was from the beginning,

That nations may come from the ends of the
earth to see his glory,

Bearing gifts to her weakened sons,

And to see the glory wherewith God hath
glorified her.

And He a righteous king taught of God shall be
over them ;

And there shall be no unrighteousness in his
days among them ;

For all shall be holy and their king the Lord's
Anointed.

For he shall not hope upon horse and rider and
bow

Nor shall he multiply gold nor silver for war,

And he shall not bring many for the day of
battle.

The Lord himself is his King,

And he shall have mercy upon all the nations
when they come before him in fear.

It is better to read in masses than in snippets,
especially when you are dealing with witnesses of
another age and foreign blood, though they trusted
and hoped in the same God according to their
lights. The Son of David here has and can have
neither art nor part in the assassination of Pompey—

God found fit tools for such deeds as that—and he will not even make proper preparations for war. An unthrifty king! He does not even spoil the Egyptians: he is content to convert them. But such were the Christs of Jahveh so far as they have deserved the title. What God had for them to do that they did—through good report and ill, whether they served their own generation only, or served this world of men for ever.

The next Psalm is very like this in essence, and it is short enough to be quoted entire :

O Lord, thy mercy is upon the works of thy
hands for ever,

Thy kindness is richly bestowed upon Israel.

Thine eyes behold thy works, and none of them
shall suffer want ;

Thine ears hearken to the hopeful prayer of
the poor.

Thy judgments and thy mercy are upon all the
earth,

And thy love is upon Abraham's seed, the
sons of Israel ;

Thy chastisement is upon us as upon a first-born
son only-begotten,

To convert the obedient soul from sins of
ignorance.

May God cleanse Israel against the day of mercy
by his blessing,

Against the day of election, *when he raiseth
up his Christ.*

Blessed are they who live in those days

To see the good things of Jahveh, which he
shall do to the coming generation ;

Under the chastening rod of the Lord's Anointed,
in the fear of his God,

In the spirit of wisdom, of righteousness, and
of strength,

To direct men in works of righteousness by the
fear of God,

To set them all before Jahveh,

A good generation and God-fearing in the days of
mercy.

Great and glorious is our God dwelling in the
highest,

Who disposed stars in their courses for the seasons
from day to day,

And they transgressed not from the path
which he commanded them.

In the fear of God is their path each day,

From the day that God created them and for
eternity.

And they went not astray from the day that he
created them ;

From generations of old they departed not
from their paths,

Save when God commanded them at the
behest of his servants.

CHAPTER IV.

THE MODERN VIEW OF THE SON OF MAN.

THERE is also nowadays what is called the Christ of Eschatology, a conception which, broadly speaking, is based upon the Gospel according to St. Mark, "as it leaves the hands of a scientific criticism unbiassed by the prepossessions of Liberal Protestantism." It appears that Liberal Protestantism has been engaged in a prolonged battle against this eschatological interpretation; and Father Tyrrell—whose recent death is a loss personal to his remotest readers—decides that the battle has done no more than "establish the superiority of the latter." The gist of this eschatological interpretation, as he sums it up, is this:

Of the Jesus Who came forward openly as the Messiah in a spiritual (i.e. a moral) sense, Who preached and exemplified the righteousness of the inward Kingdom of God, Who founded the Kingdom on earth in the form of a school of imitators and Who died solely as a martyr of morality, there is not left a single shred.

He did not oppose a moral to a worldly interpretation of the Kingdom. He took the current interpretation as he found it, which was

not worldly but other-worldly—spiritual, in the sense of metaphysical and transcendent, not in the immanent moral sense.

That I take to be the considered judgment of an impartial critic, whose own faith neither combatant could touch, and a religious teacher, whose concern was rather with the present than the past^a.

It is important to notice that this eschatological interpretation, though it rests primarily on Mark alone of the four Gospels, is yet applied to the Hope of the Jews, not only to those of them who became Christians, and, indeed, is based on the Jewish Apocalyptic literature—*taken at its face-value*. It is useful as a stick for beating Liberal Protestants and tiresome moralists, but it is not, therefore, true to all the facts of the case. Modern prepossessions—whether Liberal-Protestant or Anti-Semite or what not—are clearly contraband in any scientific exploration of ancient history, and they are absolutely prohibitive of any real success. But it will be well to get a statement of this eschatological interpretation from its protagonist rather than seem to drag Father Tyrrell into the controversy—

Others abide our question : thou art free.

The most authoritative exposition of this eschatological or apocalyptic interpretation of Christ as

^a George Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-roads* (1909) viii.

fulfilled by Jesus of Nazareth is Dr. Schweitzer's *From Reimarus to Wrede*. Mr. Montgomery's excellent English version, which is backed by the popularity of Professor Burkitt in a preface, was published in 1910 under the title *The Quest of the historical Jesus*, and has been denounced as a deadly attack upon Christianity by Professor Inge^b. For the present purpose the only question is, Does the view here taken of the Hope of Catholick Judaism cover the facts—not merely the facts that leap to meet the casual eye, but all the facts and all the religious life and aspirations, which are reflected fragmentarily in the extant literature. More than Christianity is involved: we are invited to contemplate the whole National Church of Judaism standing at the very dawn of the Christian era like the ghosts whom Virgil saw on this side the river-boundary of the next world^c:

Stretching hands in helpless longing for the
further shore.

Apart from Professor Burkitt's preface the book has impressive credentials. Dr. Schweitzer begins by displaying them^d:

^b Compare *Journal of Theological Studies* xi. p. 586: "The praise which Dr. Sanday bestowed [in his *Life of Christ in Recent Research*] upon this writer, guarded as it was, gained for a production which I am old-fashioned enough to think blasphemous a vogue . . ."

^c *Aeneid* vi. 134.

^d p. 1: I use Mr. Montgomery's translation throughout for fear of accidents.

When, at some future day, our period of civilization shall lie, closed and completed, before the eyes of later generations, German theology will stand out as a great, a unique phenomenon in the mental and spiritual life of our time. For nowhere save in the German temperament can there be found in the same perfection the living complex of conditions and factors—of philosophic thought, critical acumen, historical insight, and religious feeling without which no deep theology is possible.

And the greatest achievement of German theology is the critical investigation of the life of Jesus. What it has accomplished here has laid down the conditions and determined the course of the religious thinking of the future.

Such an exordium is well calculated to command attention. The world knows what lessons it has learned from the German temperament, in which the scientific spirit has come home to roost. It remembers the gorgeous colours derived from coal-tar, and feels as in its youth the restless imperious thrill of Heine's lyrics. And, apart from these universal benefits, it is notorious that the great authorities in any branch of knowledge are Germans. The reader is disposed at once to listen, though the book is longer than those which the writer acclaims as proper to the new era (it began in the year of our Lord 1892^e), having grateful memories of men like

Zeller and Schürer, who tantalize the independent enquirer by anticipating his discovery of facts. If he is interested at all in Christianity—to say nothing of Catholick Judaism—he must be anxious to learn the result of this critical investigation of the life of Jesus. Here is the result^f:

The Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly as the Messiah, who preached the ethic of the Kingdom of God, who founded the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, and died to give his work its final consecration, never had any existence. He is a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism and clothed by modern theology in an historical garb The historical foundation of Christianity as built up by rationalistic, by liberal, and by modern theology no longer exists, but that does not mean that Christianity has lost its historical foundation . . . Jesus means something to our world because a mighty spiritual force streams forth from him and flows through our own time also . . . It is not Jesus as historically known, but Jesus as spiritually arisen within men who is significant for our time and help it.

It is a strange book. The results, of which I hope this is a fair sample, are striking because they are so completely unexpected. The interval between the exordium and the conclusion is devoted to a

^f pp. 396—401.

criticism of the criticisms of the Gospels achieved by the master-minds aforesaid. As they measured, so Dr. Schweitzer measures them. For himself he occupies the former position of Professor Johannes Weiss, who comes nearly at the end of his series, and claims Reimarus, with whom it begins, for his predecessor. And the rest of the great scholars have merely multiplied stumbling-blocks for Professor Johannes Weiss to clear away, so that, when he turned backslider, Dr. Schweitzer might take his point of vantage and survey the rest who never got so much as a glimpse of the truth which he has forsworn. From that prospect Dr. Schweitzer says of him^s :

In Weiss there are none of these devious paths : " behold the land lies before thee."

His " Preaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God," published in 1892, has on its own lines an importance equal to that of Strauss's first Life of Jesus. He lays down the third great alternative which the study of the life of Jesus had to meet. The first was laid down by Strauss : *either* purely historical *or* purely supernatural. The second had been worked out by the Tübingen school and Holtzmann : *either* Synoptic *or* Johannine. Now came the third : *either* eschatological *or* non-eschatological ! . . .

Here is the point at which it is fitting to

recall Reimarus. He was the first, and indeed before Johannes Weiss the only, writer who recognised and pointed out that the preaching of Jesus was purely eschatological.

So the achievement of German theology in the period reviewed—an arbitrarily chosen period, since no period of civilization can be closed and completed however an ignorant and ungrateful posterity may regard it—comes to this, that, like a fog-bound wanderer, they have boxed the compass and reached after painful efforts the point from which they set out. But^h the second edition of Johannes Weiss's "Preaching of Jesus" manifests "a weakening of the eschatological standpoint."

Set aside the "Results" in which it is said with vehemence that Jesus belongs to His own time and is to our time a stranger and an enigma only to be solved by those who obey Him—and the rest is simply a scientific criticism of scientific critics. It is German theology dramatised into a machine-like progression which ends in a proper *peripeteia*. Reimarus comes by his own thanks, to Johannes Weiss, and Dr. Schweitzer takes his place. It may be scientific criticism so to see the end in the beginning; but the picture is scarcely true to life outside the lecture-room. There are three places according to the Index in which Albrecht Ritschl is mentioned and all that he is credited with is a certain *naïveté*. Such treatment of a man who—consent or not to

^h p. 301.

his doctrine—laboured much in the field of deep theology, is sufficient proof of a facile shallowness and flightiness in the critic. The “Results” are just short of the commonsense commonplaces of the Christian Faith.

But whether the book be welcomed or banned matters little enough. Our concern is with the view of Messiahship which it presents as that of Jesus and His contemporaries; and that is this:

The Kingdom is wholly future. Jesus waits for God to bring about the coming of the Kingdom by supernatural means. The exercise of his Messiahship belongs to the future. The Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus, as expressed in the title ‘Son of Man,’ shares in the transcendental apocalyptic character of Jesus’ idea of the Kingdom of God, and cannot be separated from that idea.

That is the view taken by Weiss in the first edition of his epoch-making pamphlet, as interpreted by Schweitzer¹, who repudiates the views of the second edition, and it is essentially, he tells us, the view of Reimarus.

Now an ordinary man who found himself back again at the point he started from, might well conclude that he had taken the wrong turning at critical points; and, without pressing the analogy, it is surely permissible to wonder if Strauss was right in distinguishing between the historical and

¹ pp. 238, 239.

the supernatural and in choosing the historical, and if the Tübingen school were justified in rejecting the Johannine narrative for the Synoptic. Professor Johannes Weiss has decided for himself that he was wrong in preferring the eschatological to the non-eschatological. The three alternatives are admirably fitted for graphic presentation on a black-board ; but the Jews, whom scholars try to force into their modern categories, looked for—and some found—a Christ of Jahveh who should be very Man, and also very God, as being the perfect interpreter of God's will to men, so far as they could receive it, capable of blessing them and ready to make intercession for them. They hoped in God and so lived before Him ; and they hoped for the coming of a Christ, like Moses His Arch-prophet, to confirm their assurance of Communion with God, which is Life indeed. Words like *transcendental* and *eschatology* take one very far away from the simple testimonies of the witnesses who spoke in their own language of what they had experienced and what they expected.

Dr. Schweitzer deals out labels to his predecessors in the scientific criticism of the Gospels, as they did to the Jews of long ago. Wheat and tares alike are rooted up and dried and pressed and labelled and discussed—and you learn as much about the living plant as you can learn of a fox by contemplating its mask and pads and brush, each cured and mounted for display as the relics of an animal

(vermin or not vermin) worthy to be hunted, or shot, or trapped, according to the custom of the country. For scientific investigation of living things the systematist must wait upon the biologist. You must go to the earth and hide and wait, if you want to see the vixen play with her cubs.

Transcendental is a barbarous Latin word: *eschatology* is more or less Greek in form: *apocalypses* are known quantities. Rabbinism, on the word of Dr. Schechter, repudiated the Apocalyptic literature: the scientific critic who survives Dr. Schweitzer's review battens on it. But the men who saw and wrote down these Revelations have the right to repulse such interpreters with the scorn of Coriolanus, "Follow your functions, go, and batten on cold bits." And indeed it is "cold bits" if you take it as they do. If ever there was a case of the axiom, "The letter killeth, the spirit quickeneth," it is this. For there were Jews who took this view of Apocalyptic, like the Christians of Thessalonica, and died in the desert.

Apocalyptic.

The writers of Apocalypses or Revelations were inspired to gaze into God's ordering of the world, and to describe the past and present history of the men with whom they were concerned, as they saw it unveiled and stripped of petty details and personal considerations which confused and

bewildered ordinary men^j. And like the Prophets, whose legitimate successors they are, they were inspired to see the future, however dimly, as the inevitable result, however often passing events might retard it, of the forces of good and evil, which were already at work. They described what they had seen, what they saw around them, and what they hoped to see in "transcendental" terms, partly because they could not trust themselves to define precisely what they saw of God's working on the right hand and on the left hand—St. Paul said that the revelations granted to him were quite unutterable—, and, partly, because the exemplary Revelation ascribed to the prophet Daniel belonged to the time of persecution, when it was not safe for the Jews to tell plainly their hopes and fears. In their visions they thought in terms of nations, and for such thinking vague tremendous figures were best suited. It was not for them to tell in detail what God had done or should do. Definite prevision of particular events is attested in the history of the Jews; but it was no part of the best Apocalyptic. They were poets and prophets who might scrutinise the messages they received, but could not interpret them, until fulfilment came at last^k. They lived in times when Paradise was lost again and yet again, and their business was,

^j See for a familiar example, *Romans* xi. 25—27.

^k Compare I Peter i. 10—12.

like Milton's, to submit themselves to the Spirit of God for instruction—

What in me is dark
Illumine, what is low raise and support ;
That, to the highth of this great argument,
I may assert Eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men.

They lived in troublous times, but, so far as they obeyed their heavenly visions, they themselves could claim that each of them—like each of those who could hear and understand the message they conveyed—was

One who never turned his back but marched
breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong
would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake.

The message of the Seer was no counsel of despair and no call to passive expectation of some supernatural cataclysm. It summoned men who had ears to hear, to do or suffer like men whatever God had laid upon them, in the sure hope that sooner or later the clouds would break in blessings on the head of the faithful. Man looketh on the outward appearance, the Lord looketh on the heart. It is true of men in the mass, as it is of the individual.

And the Seer had the power to see into the heart of history : for him there was no more near nor far. The present world was revealed to him as part of the world which is to come : the supernatural shone through the historical—if ever the distinction was drawn by Jewish thinkers.

Readers of Thomas Hardy's *The Dynasts* are familiar with the Apocalyptic intervention of the Spirits in the intervals of that great historical drama of the Napoleonic Wars. They know (for example) how

The nether sky opens, and Europe is disclosed as a prone and emaciated figure, the Alps shaping like a backbone and the branching mountain-chains like ribs, the peninsular plateau of Spain forming a head. . . . The point of view then sinks downwards through space, and draws near to the surface of the perturbed countries, where the peoples, distressed by events which they did not cause, are seen writhing, crawling, hearing and vibrating in their various cities and nationalities. . . .

A new and penetrating light descends on the spectacle enduing men and things with a seeming transparency, and exhibiting as one organism the anatomy of life and movement in all humanity and vitalized matter included in the display.

The modern dramatist sees behind the clouds
"the Immanent Will and Its designs,"

and says :

It works unconsciously, as heretofore,
Eternal artistries in Circumstance,
Whose patterns, wrought by rapt æsthetic rote
Seem in themselves Its single listless aim,
And not their consequence. . . .

The Jewish Apocalyptist saw the God of Israel, the God over all, who deigned to know them and to bear their name. But he also might have said something of this kind :

We'll close up Time, as a bird its van,
We'll traverse Space, as spirits can,
Link pulses severed by leagues and years,
Bring cradles into touch with biers ;
So that the far-off Consequence appears
Prompt at the heels of foregone Cause.
The PRIME, that willed ere wareness was,
Whose Brain perchance is Space, whose Thought
its laws,
Which we as threads and streams discern,
We may but muse on, never learn¹.

The vocabulary of Apocalyptic literature is appropriate to its theme, which is the Divine Economy. God is in heaven : man is upon earth. But God orders all things in heaven and in earth according to His Eternal Providence ; and His Providence changes only from men's point of view to suit the

¹ See *The Dynasts*, Part First, Fore Scene.

changing circumstances which condition their apprehension of it. God is invisible: even Moses could not see Him as He is. It was enough for men to know that He is. The seer could not dictate to God how or when His will should be accomplished: he could only behold till the end came to his vision, and he could only wonder, when he recorded it, whether the end of the vision should come to pass in a day or in a thousand years. For the end is merely a correlative term, dependent upon the seer's range of vision: so far as the phrase "eschatological interpretation" has any real meaning at all, it means that when man ends God begins—but always to work through men.

The Jews had a special reason for employing and developing the Apocalyptic vocabulary quite apart from the special circumstances of Daniel. By the Law they were denied the symbolism of graven images, and they found the necessary outlet for the expression of their religious experiences, on which their theology was based, in symbolic language, which was well understood to be merely symbolic. In the Talmud the past blessedness—it is, of course, not mere happiness—of the subjects of Queen Salome Alexandra is described in Apocalyptic language:

The Rabbis have taught, It is written, *I will give you rains in their season*^m: that is, not too much or too little, but a mean rainfall, for if

^m Leviticus xxvi. 4.

the rain is abundant the ground becomes sloppy and unfruitful. Or *in their season* means on the fourth night of the week and on Sabbath nights; for in the days of Simeon Ben Shetach we find that rain fell on the fourth and on Sabbath nights. The corns of wheat were as large as kidneys, the barley-corns as large as olives, and the lentils like golden denarii. Specimens were preserved to shew to future generations what sin entailed: as it is written, *Your iniquities have turned away these things and your sins have withholden good from you*ⁿ. And so we find also in the days of Herod, when people were busy building the Temple, the rain fell at night, but in the morning the wind blew and the clouds disappeared and the sun shone, and the people went about their day's work knowing that the work of heaven was in their hands^o.

The days of Simeon Ben Shetach were the days of Salome Alexandra, when he and the Pharisees generally governed the people in her name. Her reign was, therefore, a realization of God's sovereignty so far as Scribes learned in the Law could achieve it. This spiritual prosperity is expressed in terms of material blessings of store-house and barn.

ⁿ Jeremiah v. 25.

^o Babylonian Talmud, *Taanith* 23 a. See further, Surenhusius, *Mishnah* II. p. 374, with Josephus, *Antiquities* xiv. 2. 1 (§ 22 Niese).

As for Herod, the Herodians at any rate must have believed that he was the Christ of his time, and with some show of reason. He put down Zealots, and he kept the Roman peace. The Pharisees Sameas and Pollio were his trusted advisers, and he was privileged to rebuild the Temple. Like Solomon, he did not fulfil the promise of his youth when the collapse of a house just after he left it proved to some that he was dear to God, but pending the final disproof of his latter years there was much to encourage the Herodian faith in his Messiahship—failing a worthier claimant to the divine commission.

The final statement of this extract shews the practical character of Rabbinism and of Apocalyptic: when the Golden Age (or the World to come) came, *the people went about the day's work knowing that the work of heaven was in their hands.*

Apart from the common human craving for symbols to express what can never be stated logically or mathematically, and the special conditions which prompted the Jews to have recourse to symbolic language on general grounds as their only legitimate satisfaction of it, there were special circumstances which made it necessary for the Seer who used the name of Daniel to write in cipher and under an assumed name—thereby establishing the convention for his successors, no matter whence he derived it.

The circumstances of Apocalyptic.

When Antiochus Epiphanes came to the throne of Syria, there were Jews in Palestine who craved for assimilation to their Greek environment. The policy of segregation and separation, which Ezra and Nehemiah had enforced, had been, they thought, injurious; and their leader Joshua, who changed his Hebrew name to Jason in token of his Hellenism, bribed the King to make him high-priest with powers to make the Palestinian Jews into Greeks. The inhabitants of Jerusalem were enrolled as citizens of Antioch, and a *gymnasium* was provided for them. The young Jewish aristocrats assumed the Greek cap: those of them who were priests forsook the service of the Temple for the sports and feasts of the palæstra, and endeavoured to obliterate all the outward signs of their ancestral religion^p.

Six years later Antiochus plundered the Temple, and, being deterred by the intervention of Rome from his hope of extending his Empire, determined to complete the process of unifying it by the forcible conversion of all the Jews to the Greek way of life. The temple in Jerusalem was re-dedicated to the Abomination of Desolation—that is, Zeus Olympius, the Greek Supreme God of heaven: the temple in Gerizim was made over to Zeus Xenius—the god of strangers; and both were conducted on the

^p 1 Maccabees i. 10—15: 2 Maccabees iv. 7—15.

orthodox Greek lines. The Jewish religion with all its rites was proscribed :

Two women were brought up for having circumcised their children ; and these, when they had led them publicly round about the city, with the babes hung on their breasts, they cast headlong down from the wall.

To keep the Sabbath was certain death, for no Jew could do the work of self-defence without breaking it^q.

In such circumstances there was every reason for any communication passing between Jew and Jew to be written in cipher. The Syrian soldiers held Jerusalem and executed the commands of an Athenian named Geron, who came as the missionary and Grand Inquisitor of Hellenism. From Jerusalem they sent out raiding parties to put all Jewish Covenanters to the sword on the Sabbath, when their non-resistance proved their guilt and made their punishment mere butcher's play. But at last some of the country-people, who were proof against the seductions of Greek city-life and despised the clumsier argument of the sword, turned at bay. The Martyrs had found strength and consolation in Scripture^r ; but Scripture did not and could not contemplate the extinction of all true Jews^s.

^q 1 Maccabees i. 41—63: 2 Maccabees vi. 1—11. See further, 2 Maccabees vi. 12—vii. 42.

^r See (for example) 2 Maccabees vii. 6.

^s 1 Maccabees ii. 15—21.

When the King's officers who were enforcing the apostasy came into the city of Modein to sacrifice, many of Israel went over to them, but Mattathias and his sons offered resistance . . . Mattathias answered with a loud voice, If all the nations included in the King's dominion obey him, in that each is untrue to the worship of his fathers and chooses to follow his command, yet I and my sons and my brothers will walk in the covenant made with our fathers. Heaven forbid that we should forsake the law and the ordinances.

So Mattathias cut down a renegade who came to offer the prescribed sacrifice and the King's officer, and took to the hills, like David, with those who still sought justice and right. History soon lost sight of Mattathias^t. Jewish historians were more intent to detect the hand of God in human affairs than to preserve the memory of His less conspicuous instruments.

The missionaries of the Established Church of Hellenism followed the fugitives into the desert, where they lived on green-stuff to avoid unclean meat^u—so prevalent was the apostasy even among the country-folk from whom they might have had provisions. A thousand of them died on a Sabbath; and the rest resolved to break the Sabbath, so far

^t 2 Maccabees ignores him altogether and credits Judas with the flight and subsequent resistance.

^u 2 Maccabees v. 27.

as self-defence was a breach of the law^x. The momentous decision is slurred over in the Second Book of Maccabees along with the person of Mattathias: the transgression was necessary for the time, but to record it would have been to record a dangerous precedent, especially as it was followed by the cohesion of some of the professed religious teachers of Israel, the Hasidaeans.

The six thousand followers whom Judas the son of Mattathias led needed summoning^y; and, if any of the messengers sent carried credentials and writs from Judas or the Hasidaeans, these by all precedent must have been written in language which could not be understood by any foreigner. If dates and places were mentioned, they must have been put into the safe-keeping of a code, so many weeks or so many "times" perhaps for the date, and such and such numbers^z for places. Failing such credentials, the emissaries of Judas would have been mistaken for Syrian spies who had other uses for potential insurgents. Having them they could do what they did in the way of collecting the Jews who were still *honest men* in the sense which the Scribes and not Antiochus^a desired. In this way *Gematria* (of which

^x 1 Maccabees iv. 41—44: compare vii. 13.

^y 2 Maccabees viii. 1.

^z The name or some distinctive part of it being reduced to a figure by the addition of the numerical value of the letters.

^a 2 Maccabees ix. 19—27: letter of Antiochus addressed τοῖς χρηστοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς πολίταις. The word *Citizens* has a peculiar connotation for a Hellenizer since the city-state was the proper embodiment of

the best known example is "the number of the beast was six hundred and six"), along with symbolism and cipher, became part and parcel of the Apocalyptic convention. And it is curious that Geometry came later to be used by the Jews in much the same way as Mathematics by the Greeks, to denote the science of divining what lay beneath the superficial aspect of things. The essence of such messages was the ungotten minerals they concealed.

The Jews at the time and all who wished for whatever purpose to communicate with them were in the position of Clytemnestra, who prayed thus in the presence of her daughter Electra ^b:

Protector, Phoebus, hear and understand,
Although my speech be darkened. For I speak
In no friend's ears, nor with this maiden near
Must I unfold my meaning to the light,
Lest she with spite and rumour, thousand-tongued,
Through all the city scatter false report.

And, take Jewish literature where you will, it is characteristic of it to use metaphor and figures of speech (as we say) for their own sake. It is, perhaps, a proof of Jewish conservatism; for primitive peoples had their own script, which only their friends could read. Special circumstances developed it to the degree which it had at the first when only the

Greek culture. *Honest* was, I think, used in such a sense by both parties in the early Hanoverian period of English History.

^b Sophocles, *Electra* 637—642 (R. Whitelaw's translation).

initiated could understand—or *hear* as the bearer of the cipher would say. But the habit of using symbolism in speech or writing, which carries with it the habit of allegorical interpretation, would seem to be generally a permanent item in the furniture of the Jewish mind.

In the time of Philo there were men who vaporised the plainest commands of the Law by means of the allegorical method^c. And the Jews of Alexandria were not peculiar in this. St. Paul allegorizes the rock from which the children of Israel drank^d and so forth. And the Rabbi Eleazar ben Jose of Galilee formulated this among his thirty-two canons of exegesis, to guard against the abuse of the practice^e:

There are many parabolic sayings in the Prophets and the Writings which must be interpreted as allegories; but the Torah must not be interpreted thus except in the three cases pointed out by Ishmael ben Elisha. The passages are:

^c I p. 450 Mangey: εἰσὶ γὰρ τινες οἱ τοὺς ῥητοὺς νόμους σύμβολα νοητῶν πραγμάτων ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὰ μὲν ἄγαν ἠκρίβωσαν, τῶν δὲ ραθύμως ὀλιγώρησαν· οὓς μεμψαίμην ἂν ἔγωγε τῆς εὐχερείας· ἔδει γὰρ ἀμφοτέρων ἐπιμεληθῆναι, ζητήσεώς τε τῶν ἀφανῶν ἀκριβεστέρας καὶ ταμιείας τῶν φανερῶν ἀνεπιλήπτου . . .

^d I Corinthians x. 4: so Philo (I, p. 213 Mangey): ταῦτα δὲ ψυχῆς τροφαλὴ κυρίως εἰσὶ τῆς θηλάζειν ἱκανῆς, ὡς ὁ νομοθέτης φησί· μέλι ἐκ πέτρας καὶ ἔλαιον ἐκ στερεᾶς πέτρας (Deuteronomy xxiii. 13), πέτραν τὴν στερεὰν καὶ ἀδιάκοπον ἐμφαίνων σοφίαν θεοῦ, τὴν τροφὴν καὶ τιθηνοκόμον καὶ κουροτρόφον τῶν ᾠφθάρτου διαίτης ἐφιεμένων.

^e See Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten* II. p. 297, I². p. 239.

"If a man smitten by a stone rise again and walk abroad *upon his staff*^f": that is, *in the strength of his former health*.

"If the sun be risen upon the thief^g": that is, *if he come with a peaceful purpose*, because the sun brings peace to all the world and does not rise for him alone.

They shall *spread the garment* before the elders of the city: that is, *they lay the matter clearly before them like an unfolded garment*^h.

In all three cases the Septuagint reproduces the Hebrew faithfully, keeping the directions as Halacha—rules for conduct, that is, which must be observed literally. But the Greeks, who were busy allegorizing their own sacred books like Homer and Hesiod, had created an environment in which this Jewish propensity received every encouragement, as almost any page of Philo will shew. For Philo protests against excessive allegorization of the Law, though he does not lay down any formal rule.

The habit of using allegory was peculiarly characteristic not only of the Apocalyptic, but also of the Wisdom-literature of the Jews. Whether they wished or did not wish to keep their wisdom for their pupilsⁱ, the Sages clothed it in figures and

^f Exodus xxi. 19.

^g Exodus xxii. 2.

^h Deuteronomy xxii. 17.

ⁱ Professor Toy in his edition of *Proverbs* refers to "the habit of Oriental teachers of couching their instruction in figures, parables, and allegories" (see especially ch. 30), and asserts, "there is no evidence that such esoterism—the intention to conceal the highest

parables. Perhaps "truth embodied in a tale" was easier to remember. At any rate the function of the instructed Scribe was to interpret dark sayings with the help of Oral Tradition and a wide experience of men and things at home and abroad ^k.

These considerations must be reckoned with, if we wish to understand how the Jews intended or interpreted their own Apocalypses. In a world full of divination¹ of all kinds, they relied for knowledge of the future which was latent in the past and the present, upon their Seers, pending the advent of the Arch-prophet, who should reconcile each one of them with God and so bring the exiles home. Apocalyptic has its place in the various modes of God's revelation of His will to the Jews, and they did not misunderstand its outward form. The Seers and their hearers—to borrow a phrase from Dr. Johnson—talked as other people talked in their Society; but they had cleared their minds of cant. When Hillel authorised his disciples to put their wives away for a spoilt dinner, they read his mean-

wisdom from the mass of men—existed anywhere in the ancient world." But this was precisely Aristotle's defence of the publication of his lectures: he had expressed himself so as to publish his teaching and yet not to publish it: the rights of his pupils, like Alexander the Great, were reserved.

^k See for the real character of the Scribe, Ecclesiasticus xxxviii. 24, xxxix. I—II.

¹ For the Jewish attitude towards divination, see Josephus against Apion i. 22 (§§ 201—204 Niese).

ing through the words, and used their freedom to secure, if God willed, their legitimate hope of offspring.

One like a Son of Man.

So to come to the Revelations of Daniel, in which the figure of one like a son of man stands out to hold the gaze of all who came after him. The Gospels give evidence that the Christians dwelt upon the picture and forced their Jewish antagonists—or *vice versa*—to dwell upon it also. Then, as Western non-Jewish influence affected the Christian view of their archives, the figure was plucked out of the picture, and the symbols, which had been used to denote its essential character as the supreme revelation of God's Will, came to be regarded as prophecies literally to be fulfilled. It was one thing for Jesus of Nazareth to say to the High-priest, Ye shall see the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven; and it was another thing for St. Paul to hold such language at Thessalonica. The Jews knew the interpretation of the whole vision: the Greeks did not. Lucian and Aelian shew plainly that there were persons within the frontiers of the Roman Empire, who would have been ready to expect the visible coming of any of the Four Great Beasts of the vision—to say nothing of a man trailing clouds of glory behind him. So *this* figure was wrenched from its fabric. The Beasts were ignored or rated at their true

value as symbols ; but the Human Form was treated as something real—and that although the inspired Seer had been inspired to interpret this part of his vision along with the rest. It was reserved for Christian painters to transgress the letter as well as the spirit of the sound Mosaic law against making likenesses, and depict God as the Ancient of Days.

Daniel had the gift of revelation or prophecy, but he had also the gift of interpretation^m. Without this he would have been speaking in an unknown tongue and without the power to communicate his message even to his fellows. Having it, he said once for all that the human figure represented the body of the Saints. His language and method made the past and present vague: the future was vague to his eyes. He could but hope that God in His mercy would accomplish the establishment of His Kingdom, when all should obey Him and, therefore, be holy. The past had held holy men, God's prophets and sages and scribesⁿ. Jeremiah, with whose prophecies he concerned himself^o, had spoken of a new covenant to which all the Jews should willingly adhere, because the law had

^m See I Corinthians xiv.

ⁿ Matthew xxiii. 34.

^o Jeremiah foresaw seventy years of desolation for Israel (xxv. 12, xxix. 10, Daniel ix. 2). But the restoration promised did not arrive ; and it was revealed to Daniel (ix. 20—24) that seventy weeks of years were intended, in accordance with the Scripture, " And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins " (Leviticus xxvi. 18).

been written in their hearts, and all should know God^p. Therefore, the Empire symbolised by a man and not a beast is the Empire of the Saints—the pious Jews, whom Antiochus had vainly tried to wear away^q. But it is Antiochus, and not the agents of his overthrow, who is described in detail. The everlasting Empire still belongs to visions of the night^r:

I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like to a Son of man, and he came even to the Ancient of Days, and was brought near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory and sovereignty, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his sovereignty one which shall not be destroyed.

Whatever the interpretation, the vision is one of hope and comfort; and yet the Seer says^s:

As for me, Daniel, my spirit was grieved by reason of this, and the visions of my head troubled me.

Granted the success of Judas Maccabæus, the Theocracy was not firmly established, and there was the fatal lack of a faithful prophet. The vacillation of the Hasidaeans, and the welcome which they extended to such a high-priest of the Seed of Aaron

^p Jeremiah xxxi. 31—34.

^r Daniel vii. 13, 14.

^q Daniel vii. 25, 27.

^s Daniel vii. 15.

as Alcimus, prove, that they had no clear assurance of God's will independently of the old order of the Temple-service. Daniel expresses their confidence, and also the uneasiness they felt in their immediate circumstances.

The Son of Man.

From these night-visions the figure of one like a man, which owes its significance to the contrasted beasts and is explained as the saints of the Most High, was conveyed (it would seem) by one who wrote in the name of Enoch^t—legitimately enough because he also was a Seer. In the Gospels it occurs in the sayings of Jesus in the form of *The Son of The Man*, and it was regarded by Christians from the earliest times as the name by which Jesus referred to Himself. So primitive and so fixed was this idea that references to man in general have been forced from different motives to suit *The Son of Man* in particular; and whereas (for example) Mark reports Jesus as saying, "All things shall be forgiven to the sons of men except the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost^u," Matthew and Luke turn it into, "Blasphemy against the Son of Man shall be forgiven"—so that the family of Jesus may be exculpated from the unpardonable offence,

^t Ethiopic Enoch 37—71.

^u See Mark iii. 28—30 with 21, and compare Matthew xii. 31 (which reproduces the original saying with τοῖς ἀνθρώποις) 32 (=Luke xii. 10).

of which Mark's narrative might seem to accuse them along with the Scribes.

In Hebrew poetry Son of Man is used as tantamount to mankind in general, as for example in the eighth Psalm.

What is *man* that Thou shouldst be mindful of him?

Or the *son of mankind* that thou shouldst visit him?

And it is important for the use of the phrase in later times, that this Psalm repeats the assertion of man's dominion over God's creatures which was made to Adam before the Fall. Possibly such uses may be brought in to justify Daniel's interpretation of it as a collective term for the Saints^x; but this is unnecessary in view of the conditions of the vision in which one human figure is legitimately so taken just as a diviner might regard an Eagle as representing the whole of the Roman Empire. But the form of the phrase suggests an individual of the human species, and it is used in Ezekiel's reports of God's messages as the term by which the inner voice addressed him.

In addition to these formal precedents there are three lines of thought arising out of Scripture which may have prompted the conveyance of the term from poetry and the vision into plain prose as

^x Compare Matthew ix. 6, 8, ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας . . . ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεόν, τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

a term, fully as vague as *the Messiah* ^y, to designate the future Arch-prophet.

There is first the description of Adam as he was before the Fall. The religious and the true value of this explanation of the origin of sin has been expressed once for all by St. Paul^z. It is the normal experience of every man as he emerges from the innocent and careless ignorance of childhood :

There was a time when I—who have spent so many years in would-be complete obedience to the law of Moses—was living as yet without any law at all. But when I realised at last the meaning of the commandment *thou shalt not covet*, sin awoke within me : I was tempted and fell—whether in thought or word or deed.

But apart from the story of the Fall, which belongs to the second account of the Creation of man, and might, therefore, be distinguished from the first account, as by Philo, the primitive state of man was a state of perfection^a. Made in God's image, the man and his wife ruled over His creatures. God blessed them and saw that all He had made was good. Under the supremacy of man the animal world as a whole was at peace within itself. Man had the grain and fruits for his food : the beasts had the greenness of herbage ; and so God instituted

^y John xii. 34.

^z Romans vii. 7—11.

^a See Genesis i.—ii. 3.

the Sabbath and rested from His labour. In later times men used this picture to paint their hopes of a future when men should not hurt nor destroy in the holy mountain and the lion should eat straw like an ox. It is here in the Priests' Code, as it is called nowadays, that the Jews looked for the ideal man, the first Adam, who as yet was free from sin.

St. Paul seems to ignore the fact that the second account of Creation is distinct from the first, bases his portrait of the second Adam upon the glorified Christ, and asserts (in obvious opposition to accepted doctrine) that the spiritual does not precede the natural^b but follows it. He uses the Jewish categories, but now in accordance with his faith that the Hope of Judaism had been realized in the Lord Jesus. Philo, on the other hand, distinguished sharply between "the Priests' Code" and "Yahwistic" narrative. He held that the spiritual man was created first and then the earthly, just as it stands written in Scripture :

There are two kinds of men, the heavenly and the earthly. The heavenly man being made in God's likeness has no share of corruptible and material substance, but the earthly was compact of scattered matter which Scripture calls *dust*.

Then there is the true man Enos, who first hoped on God^c and left an example of what full humanity

^b 1 Corinthians xv. 46.

^c Gen. iv. 26 (Septuagint).

was. And there is also the prophecy of Balaam ^d, who uttered God's message in spite of himself :

Thus saith the man who truly sees
And speaks as he hears the oracles of God ;
Who saw a vision of God :
In sleep his eyes were opened.
How beautiful are thy houses, O Jacob,
And thy tents O Israel . . .
Like tents which Jahveh pitched,
Like cedars by the waters.
A man shall come forth from his seed
And rule many nations . . .
I will shew it to him, but not now :
I bless him, and he comes not near.
A star shall dawn from Jacob,
And a man shall rise up from Israel.

. It is all Greek evidence ; but the Greek translators of the Pentateuch (at any rate) were picked for their knowledge of both Greek and Hebrew. Indeed, all the Seventy were probably Scribes who had already studied the Scriptures with the aid of the Palestinian Oral Tradition at home, and were travelling to complete their training by practical work abroad. That the interpretations put upon the Law in the Septuagint come down to us in Greek is no proof that they originated in Greek. Often they represent, like the *hope* of Enos, merely a different vocalization of the Hebrew ; and, generally, it is improbable that

^d Numbers xxiv. 4—7, 17 (Septuagint).

any Scripture would have been entrusted to incompetent translators.

These particular cases of Man, as he was in the image of God, of Man, as he must be now, and of the Man who shall arise—no mere shooting-star like Barcochebas, who was also Bar Coziba, the liar—deserve to be taken into account as elements in the conception of The Son of the Man, as the Greek has it.

CHAPTER V.

THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN HISTORY.

THE History of the Jews provides the necessary corrective to narrow conceptions of their Hope, formed in modern times when the natural is distinguished from the supernatural, and so forth, and fathered indiscriminately upon "every pious Jew" and upon all primitive Christians. And the Scriptures helped to make Jewish history, by supplying direct precepts and examples of the consequences of different attitudes towards those precepts. The whole of the Old Testament is necessary for the full understanding of the Seers who wrote Revelations, as it is for the comprehension of the first Christian missionaries.

Sir Charles Russell, speaking in defence of Ireland, said before the Parnell Commission :

In order to understand the feelings, motives, and springs of action of nations and of individual men, and the leading citizens in a nation, you cannot avoid looking back to the early history of the country. As well might one attempt to understand the genius of the English people and of English institutions without reference to the Revolution and the Bill of Rights, and the

Reform Bill and Free Trade . . . as to endeavour to understand—

One may fairly continue, as to endeavour to understand Judaism without reference to the deliverance from Egypt and the Covenant with Jahveh at Sinai, the restoration of the Law by Ezra, and the admission of the people to the knowledge of it by the Scribes, and the training of those Scribes at home and abroad in an atmosphere of free thought subject only to the fundamental principles of their Faith. It was no dead hand of the past that held them in its grip; but the hand of the living God who had made Israel His son and heir by adoption.

The Great Apostasy of the Jews.

Both the First and the Second Books of the Maccabees use the language and method of Apocalyptic to describe what they had actually seen taking place. The writer of the Second Book^a (for example) prefaces his narrative with an account of the great apparition, which “the Sovereign of spirits^b and of all authority” produced to defend the Temple against Heliodorus—in order to shew pictorially the secret working of the hand of God. The First Book^c describes the apostasy of the Hellenizing Jews as causing earthquakes, and, at the point when the persecution of the faithful in

^a iii.

^b iii. 24: compare Ethiopic Enoch 37—71 (*passim*).

^c i. 26—28.

its first phase began, it gives no details but a general picture :

And they shed innocent blood on every side of the
sanctuary,

And polluted the sanctuary.

Then the inhabitants of Jerusalem fled because of
this,

And she became the habitation of foreigners. . . .

Her sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness,

Her feasts were turned into mourning,

Her sabbaths into a reproach,

Her honour into contempt.

So great as was once her glory, so now was her
dishonour ;

And her exaltation was turned into mourning^d.

The Maccabean Martyrs.

Of the martyrdoms which followed in the second phase of the persecution, when a "thorough" policy was systematically carried out, the First Book relates^e generally the desecration of the sanctuary, the erection of heathen altars, the burning of the books of the Law, and the execution of those who possessed copies of it or attempted to obey it. The Second Book^f gives details and also the *Acts* of some

^d i. 36—40. The translation is taken from the Student's Old Testament by Professor C. F. Kent, the volumes of which I have found very useful at times when I was obliged to be content with a minimum of books.

^e i. 41—63.

^f vi. 1—vii. 42.

of these Jewish Martyrs, in which they express their conception of this manifestation of God's will, in accordance with the writer's general principle^g that "these punishments were not for the destruction but for the discipline of the race."

Eleazar, one of the principal Scribes, a man of ninety years, was bidden to the heathen sacrifice and privately assured that he might bring meat of his own providing to eat at the meal. But he refused to save himself by such hypocrisy and was scourged. At the point of death he groaned and said :

To the Lord who hath the holy knowledge it is manifest that though I could have been released from death, I endure the grievous pains of scourging in my body, but in my soul I gladly suffer them for fear of him.

So he died leaving his death to the nation at large as a pattern of nobleness, and a memorial of virtue.

Then seven brothers—one a mere lad—were arrested with their mother; and all, since they refused to transgress the Law, were put to death after mockery and indescribable tortures. The mother saw them perish one by one, and bore it with a good heart because of her hope in the Lord, and exhorted each of them in their native tongue :

I know not how ye came into my womb, it was not I who gave you spirit and life, nor did I fit together the elements out of which you

were made. Wherefore, the Creator of the world, who fashioned the birth of man and devised the generation of all things, restoreth to you again in his mercy both spirit and life, because ye now deny and despise your own selves for the sake of his laws.

When it came to the turn of the youngest, the king—or his officer—swore that, if the boy would recant, he would enrich and ennoble him, and bade the mother counsel him to save himself. But she said to him—still in their own native tongue :

Son, have pity on thy mother who bare thee nine months in her womb, and suckled thee three years, and reared thee to this age. Pity me, child, and do my bidding. Look up to Heaven, behold the earth and all that is in earth and heaven, and know that, as God made them not out of things that were, so the race of man comes into being at His command. Fear not this hangman. Shew thyself worthy of thy brethren, and welcome death, that in God's mercy I may regain thee with them.

And last of all after her sons the mother died.

Here is the Hope of Catholick Judaism in action. Is it eschatological or non-eschatological ?

This mother in Israel believed—or, if you will, the Scribe who read the lesson of her sufferings declared for her—that God who had deigned to reveal

Himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob gave to them and their worthy descendants spirit and life when they quitted this world. He was God Eternal and Almighty, therefore the men with whom He entered into relation must always live before Him. The stress of persecution called out the truth, necessary for the times, which was latent in the Law. The resurrection of the faithful was as certain as their birth ; and both this life and the next were the gift of God who kept His promises. And when these men died in their innocency, cut off in their strength, their youth, and even in their infancy, because they kept themselves pure, the future life was brought very close to the present life, and the artificial conventional barrier was broken down.

It is by faith we perceive that God created the world out of nothing. Cosmogonies are neither here nor there. The sun rises and sets before our eyes. The laws of curfew and lighting-up-time are regulated by what every one can see. It may be that the sun is, as the Babylonian astrologers divined, the centre of the universe ; but that concerns the astronomer and is nothing to those of us who are neither astronomers nor astrologers. The figure, the metaphor of the heaven above for the abode of God, is unaffected, if it is not confirmed for day-light use. We can still reply to the *Sursum corda* with *Habemus ad Dominum*. The value of the creed, that God made the world out of nothing, on which these martyrs relied, is that it made it impos-

sible to distinguish between *natural* and *supernatural*. To Job the birth of a man was a miracle, and the Eighteen Benedictions stand in the Jewish Prayer-Book to remind the Jews that it is God who hath made us and everything else : as ben Sira said :

See the rainbow and bless Him who made it.

It is also Christian doctrine as well as Jewish that God clothes the lilies of the field and feeds even the ravens who gorge themselves with carrion, that not a sparrow falls to the ground without the Father who is in Heaven.

But the fact that these Martyrs and many more died for their obedience to God's revelation of His will and in accordance with it—that the seven brethren died in their youth *because* they honoured their mother—is more than evidence that a reward was laid up for those who thus hated their souls. That is the conclusion which Daniel drew from this period of Jewish history—whether he saw it happen or was granted foresight such as the heathen had. He says ^h :

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.

The first explicit affirmation of the resurrection

^h Daniel xii. 2, 3.

of the dead in Jewish literature is tentative and limited to the persecutors and their victims—"many shall awake." But it contains also a hint of the value of their death for their fellows, as a ransom for the many who were, as a fact, turned by the guidance of wise teachers from the enticements of the Hellenizers to righteousness. No man liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself. The success of Judas and the re-dedication of the Temple may well have made men hope that the sufferings of Messiah were accomplished. Those who lived longer saw, as St. Paul was to see, that even the Passion of our Lord did not release His followers from drinking His cup and from being immersed—not drowned—in His baptism of suffering.

The speeches ascribed to the seven sons of this widow woman—for her husband was an apostate, if he was not merely dead—indicate the solidarity of the Jews. Their suffering is the punishment of national sin, not merely the sin of the individual sufferers. That suffering is conceived as an atonement for the sin of the Nation, for the many who remained righteous. And they found their consolation in Scripture :

The Lord God beholdeth and in truth hath compassion on us, as Moses declared in his Song, which witnesseth against them openly saying :

And he shall have compassion upon his servants ⁱ.

ⁱ 2 Maccabees vii. 6 : Deuteronomy xxxii. 36.

If it be true that the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah was not interpreted by the Jews "Messianically" at this time, the fact is presumptive evidence that it was not already written or known as Scripture.

The turning of many to righteousness.

Israel was in bondage again, but now within the borders of the Promised Land. The Temple was desecrated and the Religion was proscribed. From the Holy City bands of Greek Inquisitors went forth to put their simple tests: "Will you sacrifice and eat swineflesh?"—"Have you circumcised your child?" There was no need to put into words the question, "Do you keep Sabbath?": a drawn sword would have saved their victims from massacre.

It was as it had been when "there arose a new king over Egypt which knew not Joseph." But now the persecution was religious as well as racial; and the danger of extermination was aggravated by the temptation to apostasy. As God raised up Moses then to deliver the people and organize them into a nation, to frame a constitution and to deliver them God's Law, to ordain a priesthood and set elders to govern them; so now, when the priests were apostates, when the possession or observance of the written Law meant death and not life, there was sore need of a deliverer like Moses.

Deliverers came, each in his appointed order. Judas was not a lineal descendant of David, but he

bore the name of Judah, from whom the governor should come; and Jonathan was his brother by birth, as his namesake was David's brother by love. With them and after them both was Simon, who was, like Solomon, renowned for his wisdom. Types and prophecies were being fulfilled, and the fulfilments gave the Jews fresh courage and a lawful cause. Since Jerusalem was forbidden them, they made Mizpeh their rallying-place; for in Mizpeh there was a place of prayer for Israel^k. When Judas led three thousand ill-armed men against Gorgias, he bade them, Remember how our fathers were saved in the Red Sea when Pharaoh pursued them with a host^l. And when the regent of the Seleucid empire came next year, he prayed and said:

Blessed art thou, O Saviour of Israel, who didst shatter the onslaught of the mighty man by the hand of thy servant David, and didst deliver the army of the Gentiles into the hands of Jonathan, son of Saul, and his armour-bearer^m.

The Second Book of Maccabees replaces the ancient precedents of God's intervention in the persons of those commissioned to do His will, by an account of an apparition of one in white apparel brandishing weapons of goldⁿ. Both assert in their own ways that the sword of Judas was the sword of the

^k 1 Maccabees iii. 46: compare 1 Samuel vii. 5—9.

^l 1 Maccabees iv. 6—9.

^m 1 Maccabees iv. 28 ff.

ⁿ 2 Maccabees xi. 8.

Lord; and that the triumph, which was not won by this battle, was His also. For God had other servants to bring about the purification of His Temple: the ambassadors of Rome entered the history of the Jews as keepers of the Great King's peace °.

So the service of the Temple, which was part and parcel of the old covenant, was restored ^p, and Judas proceeded to effect the ingathering of the scattered Jews of Galilee and Gilead, taking vengeance upon their oppressors. One stronghold they stormed without siege-engines by the aid of "the great Potentate of the world who levelled Jericho with the ground in the days of Joshua ^q."

Thus the historians shew cause why Judas and his brethren were set apart in the minds of men as the Seed by whose hand salvation was given to Israel ^r. Here a little and there a little, the exploits of Judas fulfilled the prophecies, and repeated the achievements of Moses, Joshua and David. If the title Christ had been known to these chroniclers, they surely would have said this was the Lord's Anointed

° 2 Maccabees xi. 34—38.

^p 1 Maccabees iv. 36—61; 2 Maccabees x. 1—9.

^q It is quite obvious that the author of 2 Maccabees interprets rationally the Scriptural story of the fall of Jericho as accomplished in the same way: οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν ἐπικαλεσάμενοι τὴν μέγαν τοῦ κόσμου δυνάστην, τὸν ἄτερ κριῶν καὶ μηχανῶν ὀργανικῶν κατακρημνίσαντα τὴν Ἱεριχῶ κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ χρόνους, ἐνέσεισαν θηριωδῶς τῷ τείχει (xii. 15).

^r 1 Maccabees v. 62: αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων, οἷς ἐδόθη σωτηρία Ἰσραὴλ διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν.

in his days ; for his success against odds was proof of a prescience, which made him in some sense a Prophet also. Certainly they regarded him as the God-sent deliverer, and with good reason ; and the failure of those who emulated his exploits confirmed them in their belief ^s.

The failings of God's Champions.

One such failure illustrates the conditions which were necessary to success in this warfare according to the opinion of some of the Scribes^t. The First Book of Maccabees reports that certain priests were slain in battle when they unwisely went out to fight : the Second Book^u gives full details :

After Esdris^x and his followers had fought long and were wearied, Judas called upon the Lord to show himself their ally and the leader of their van of battle. And then in the language of his fathers he raised the battle-cry accompanied by hymns. . . . Then Judas came with his army to the city of Adullam ; and as the seventh day drew near *according to their custom they purified themselves and kept the sabbath there*. Next day they took up the fallen, and under the garments of each of them they

^s 1 Maccabees v. 55—64.

^t v. 67.

^u xii. 36—45.

^x i.e. Esri = Help (of the Lord), a title for Judas and his brethren, the chosen Seed.

found consecrated tokens of the idols of Jamnia ; and it became clear to all why they had fallen.

Judas exhorted his men to keep themselves from sin and took up a collection which he sent to Jerusalem for a sin-offering—a practical proof, as the writer observes, of his belief in the resurrection of even these dead men ^v.

In view of this gross transgression of the Law by some who fought for it, of the continual breaking of the Sabbath which war entailed, and of the bloody vengeance wreaked upon the persecutors of the Jews, the allegiance of the Scribes, who were primarily religious teachers, began to waver. An edict of religious toleration was published by the Syrian Court^z ; and, with a new king on the throne, the Hellenizing Jews procured an apple of discord for the insurgents in the shape of the High-Priest Alcimus, a son of Levi^a, without whom the Temple-service was technically impossible. How deeply the Scribes had longed for the son of Levi they shewed at once. Though he was accompanied by Syrian troops, they did not hesitate to seek peace with him, for they said :

^v Our Lord condemns certain Scribes who devour the resources of widows on the pretext that they are praying for their deceased husbands, on the counts of their taking pay for it and of their failure to do what they promised. See Mark xii. 40.

^z 1 Maccabees vi. 55—63 : 2 Maccabees xiii. 23—26.

^a 1 Maccabees vii. 5—18 (compare 2 Maccabees xiv.).

One of the seed of Aaron has come with the forces, and he will do us no wrong.

Alcimus swore that he would not, and killed sixty of them in one day; and the survivors comforted themselves with the thought that thus the Scripture was fulfilled which said ^b:

The flesh of thy saints and their blood they poured out round about Jerusalem, and there was no man to bury them.

This was clear proof that the sons of Levi and Aaron were as bad as ever, and so Judas was enabled to do his work: the enemy fled before him like the armies of Sennacherib before Hezekiah^c, and he concluded a treaty with Rome^d, whose representatives indulged in such treaties of alliance for the sake of congenial occupation at some convenient season.

The New Age.

To pass over some years, international politics worked themselves out in favour of the Jews. Jonathan and Simon continued the struggle, after the death of Judas, for aggrandisement of their

^b 1 Maccabees vii. 17: κατὰ τοὺς λόγους οὗς ἔγραψεν· σάρκας ὁσίων σου καὶ αἵματα αὐτῶν ἐξέχεαν κύκλῳ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ θάπτων = Psalm lxxix. 2, 3, ἔθεντο . . . τὰς σάρκας τῶν ὁσίων σου τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς· ἐξέχεαν τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν ὡς ὕδωρ κύκλῳ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ θάπτων.

^c 1 Maccabees vii. 41 = 2 Maccabees xv. 22.

^d 1 Maccabees viii.

own political importance rather than for freedom of conscience, till at last the political form of the Messianic Hope was realised ; and the New Age began. Their Seers had seen apparitions fighting for them in the forefront of the battle or guarding the Sanctuary of God. The political Hope and the Apocalyptic Hope had come true. The dispersion had been gathered in, and many other prophecies fulfilled. The world which was to come, had come. Of legitimate and treacherous high-priests they had had their fill ; and they were in a position to make their own high-priest. Judas Maccabæus had given proof of his capacity for filling more than one part. Presumably he had celebrated or ordained others to celebrate the ancient sacrifices. But now Simon his brother was to be formally proclaimed as prince and priest.

In the hundred and seventieth year (142 B.C.), the yoke of the heathen was taken away from Israel. The heathen garrison evacuated the citadel in Jerusalem. So the land had rest all the days of Simon, and the people began to write in their legal documents and contracts. In the *first* year of Simon the great high-priest and commander and governor of the Jews, the alliances with Rome and the treaty with Sparta, the traditional foe of Athenian Hellenism, were renewed, and in gratitude for their prosperity the Jews and the priests in the name of the General Assembly published an edict in the *third* year of the New Age declaring Simon governor

and high-priest for ever *until there should arise a faithful prophet*. Simon consented to be high-priest, to be general and governor of the Jews and of the priests, and to be protector of all. On the point of the all-important proviso, *until there should arise a faithful prophet*, Simon characteristically preserved a significant silence ^e.

So far as he was Lord Protector of God's people for ever^f, Simon was *de facto* son and heir of David; but as a nobleman of the Syrian peerage, and a vassal (however independent) of the Seleucid king, he held exactly the same position as Joseph held in Egypt. And it is a remarkable fact that neither Joseph, although he served his brethren, nor any other politician was regarded with any degree of favour by Philo: they were for him, indeed, midway between the true Jew and the apostate ^g:

There are some men who shake off altogether the mixed multitude ^h, that followed Israel out of Egypt, and the hairy manⁱ like Esau, who was divided in his mind as to which of many ends he should direct his life. They have nothing in common with such types and tendencies, set a wall of partition to keep them off, and delight only in the love of God.

But there are others who still associate with

^e See 1 Maccabees xiii. 41—xiv. 49.

^f That is, he and his heirs: compare 1 Maccabees xiv. 49.

^g See (for example) *de migratione*, pp. 459—461 Mangey.

^h Exodus xii. 38.

ⁱ Genesis xxvii. 11.

such people, who think their life can be lived midway between excellence as God appraises it and excellence as men appraise it, so that they can lay hold both on real and on reputed excellence—and, in fact, make the best of both worlds. They belong to the type of the politician or statesman, which is exemplified in Joseph standing midway between the house of Pharaoh and his father's house^k. At one time he says, I belong to God^l, and abides by the ordinances of his father's house, reaching out after spiritual happiness; and then he goes riding in the chariot next to Pharaoh's^m, filled with the vain pride of material prosperity.

The verdict was true enough of the Hasmonaean princes. Priests as they were—and they clung to the priesthood, even when their mercenaries made them independent of the authority it gave them—they were also politicians or statesmen caring for place and power, and intent upon compromise, conceiving not the best but the second-best as their objective.

But it was not only a sound instinct which led the people to limit the dynasty of Simon to such time as should see the advent of a faithful prophet. It was the mainspring of their Hope in God that such a prophet should arise to mediate between God and man by declaring God's will to them as they

^k Genesis l. 7, 8.^l Genesis l. 19.^m Genesis xli. 43.

could understand it, withholding nothing that could be told and interpolating nothing of his own.

This proclamation goes to the root of the matter and reveals the secret of the Messianic Hope. The New Age had come. Whether we have or have not coins to prove it, the evidence is good that there was a first year and a third year of Simon's reign as the heir of the promise given to David, with the high-priesthood to cover what flaws might be found in his title. But just then, when the Nation had seen their political independence achieved and, therefore, according to some modern critics had nothing left to hope for, they put it on record that the dynasty which had been God's instrument—the chosen Seed—for effecting their deliverance, could only hold office on sufferance.

The period of Expectation.

Simon's kingdom passed into the firm clutch of the Herods, sons of Antipater the Idumaeon, before a prophet came to question the right of Simon's house to reign for ever. Scribes quoted the example of Moses, who would not combine the government of the nation with the priesthood, and only succeeded in providing an excuse for the reigning monarch to be done with the religion in which he had been bred. One king was credited with the prophetic gift and so gained a triple crown as prophet, priest,

and kingⁿ; but his prophecy did not amount to more than mere foresight, based on insight into the character of his sons, and can only have been verified after his death. The New Age and the new dynasty petered out in a welter of Sectarianism. "Lo here and lo there" men hoped to find a prophet, endowed with one or other of the titles proper to the old dispensation; for in spite of the lessons of the Dispersion they could conceive of no other mechanism by which the King's government could be carried on. And since all believers knew that the Lord's Anointed must abide for ever—there were statesmen enough and blood-thirsty warriors enough to tide over a temporary crisis—they could picture to themselves a Messianic Age without any personal Messiah at all, since the Prophet must needs merge his own identity completely, if he was to be the perfect vehicle of God's new revelation.

John Baptist.

Then out of a Babel of reminiscences of ancient days and ancient heroes, whose echoes are preserved in the Pseudepigrapha, there came a man dressed in the prophetic garb, but neither a revolutionary nor one who wore the hairy mantle to deceive. The embodiment of the voice from heaven—of the Bath Qol, which had still been heard in the absence of the

ⁿ Even so he was not a prophet like Moses; because Moses had the function of Lawgiver also, and it was the Law which secured his hold upon posterity.

fuller inspiration of a prophet—, John Baptist offered to those who were ready to convert to God at his word the ceremony of baptism as the outward sign of that return or conversion. And many accepted it as the seal of their resolve, whenever taken, to follow the commandments of God, however they might be revealed, and so accepted the yoke of God's Kingdom and furnished their King with loyal subjects.

Jesus Christ.

Among those who came was Jesus of Nazareth ; and John recognised in Him the Lamb of God, in accordance, perhaps, with the familiar name of Israel as the sheep of God's pasture, helpless without His care and wholly obedient to His will. Some believed, and continued to believe in Him, though He justified the title John had given Him. He was not a revolutionary, and He refused to pray for a sign from heaven, in order to prove His claim to be the Prophet to the blind believers in Apocalyptic texts. And He prophesied His own death.

Here was a dilemma : if He, the Prophet of God, affirmed anything at all in reference to the future, He was discredited and discarded by God, if that affirmation were not proved true. Yet, had this Arch-Prophet—He was nothing if not a Prophet, He was just God's Prophet—had He merely come to die like the Maccabean Martyrs ; and that, at

a time when Rome continued to restrain the forces of evil, and to guarantee the religious liberty of the nation, and to protect the Temple and even the Temple-tribute, which poured in from the Jews of the Dispersion ?

It was a dilemma which seemed insuperable. True, He spoke to His disciples of a resurrection on the third day ; but that for them meant no more than the general resurrection in the far-off, dim and distant future. Many of the Pharisees could not but wonder and wait.

When the end came, Barabbas, a Christ of another sort, was proposed as a substitute for this Lamb of God. Some of the Scribes may have thought to find in him the ram caught in the thicket which saved Isaac. But the rabble were enamoured of Zealotry for the moment and preferred to preserve one who had at any rate struck a blow for national independence.

So Jesus gave Himself in life and in death as a ransom for many, dedicated Himself in life and in death to the service of God, who loves and will not leave His creatures without a comforter and without an advocate to plead their cause. The Levites and priests were a ransom for the people in their lives : their call was to self-sacrifice. The Maccabean Martyrs had been the ransom of their nation by their death.

Jesus Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures: he was buried: and he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve.

The Christian faith is this :

God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds ;

Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high °.

And the Christian faith is that our Lord was the fulfilment of the Hope of Catholick Judaism, was the Arch-Prophet for whom the Jews had looked since the days when the old covenant mediated by Moses with all the ancient fabric and machinery of Judaism began to grow old, when obedience to the Law brought death and not life, when the Temple was far off, and when the priests betrayed their trust. There had been many Christs between Moses and Jesus, but they were

° Hebrews i. 1—3.

only palliatives. Tried by the test of Josephus, Jesus was the Prophet like Moses, and more ; and Philo told the world what the Jewish conception of that Arch-Prophet was—his “Christology” is as lofty as that of St. Paul or *the Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius.*

Jesus the crucified Christ was *anathema* in the eyes of the Law. St. Paul^p was ready to be himself *anathema* and excommunicate from the Crucified Christ for the sake of his brethren. He discerned that their rejection of the Gospel had opened the way for the reconciliation of the world to God ; and he believed that if they should receive it and so be received again, the Sovranty of God would surely be fully come.

^p See Romans ix, 3, xi. 15.

PRINTED BY JAMES PARKER AND CO.,
CROWN YARD, OXFORD.

BM
615
H33

Hart
Hope of Catholic Jud-
alism
335338

Arthur C. Ide
James Brown

BM
615
H33

2
76
a

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



44 758 387

335338

BM

615

H33

338

ick Jul-

SWIFT LIBRARY

7
7
7

17
2

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



44 758 387